A.S. MAKARENKO

PROBLEMS OF SOVIET SCHOOL EDUCATION

Anton Makarenko

A. Makarenko

PROBLEMS OF SOVIET SCHOOL EDUCATION

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS • MOSCOW

Compiled by Candidates of Pedagogical Science

V. ARANSKY and A. PISKUNOV

Translated from the Russian by O. SHARTSE

А. Макаренко

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ШКОЛЬНОГО СОВЕТСКОГО ВОСПИТАНИЯ

На английском языке

First printing 1965

Contents

A. S. Makarenko—an Outstanding Soviet Educator 5

LECTURE ONE. Methods of Upbringing 27

LECTURE TWO. Discipline, Regimen, Punishment and Reward 54

LECTURE THREE. Methods of Individual Approach 88

LECTURE FOUR. Work Training, Relations, Style and Tone 117

A. S. Makarenko—an Outstanding Soviet Educator

Every historical epoch has had its educators whose practical activity and theoretical views exerted a strong influence on the educational philosophy and teaching methods of the time.

Many of the pedagogical principles maintained by Jan Komenski and John Locke (17th century), Jean Jacques Rousseau (18th century), Johann Pestalozzi (end 18th-beginning 19th century), Johann Herbart, Friedrich Deisterweg and K. Ushinsky (19th century), are invaluable contributions to the treasure house of world pedagogical thought. The views of these outstanding educators and thinkers determined in considerable measure the development of the theory and practice of education over the course of decades and even centuries.

In the middle of the twentieth century the same role is played by the pedagogical heritage of Anton Makarenko, the Soviet practising educator, theoretician and writer.

The name of this remarkable man, who has greatly furthered the development of Soviet pedagogy and practice of communist education, is well known not only in the Soviet Union but also far beyond its boundaries. Makarenko's educational novels *The Road to Life* and *Learning to Live* are read with absorbing interest in different parts of the world.

Makarenko's *Problems of Soviet School Education,* which is a generalisation of his vast pedagogical experience and which contains profound theoretical conclusions, has long been the bible of Soviet teachers. It is a series of lectures read by Makarenko for the staff of the People's Commissariat of Education, R.S.F.S.R., in January 1938.

His *Lectures on the Upbringing of Children* and his *Book for Parents* are the only handbooks of their kind on Soviet home upbringing.

Makarenko's pedagogical views are based on the Marxist-Leninist teaching on education. He practised the ideas set forth in this teaching both at the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune.

Today, his experience is being creatively applied not only in the U.S.S.R. but also in Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Mongolia, and other countries. His books on education are studied with interest by progressive teachers all over the world.

* * *

Anton Semyonovich Makarenko was born into a working family on March 13, 1888, in Byelopolye, Kharkov Gubernia. His father was a painter in the railway workshops, and hard up though he was he managed to pay for Anton's education at the town's six-year school and after that for a year's teachers' training course at the same school.

He began to teach school in 1905, the year of the first Russian revolution, in Kryukovo, a suburb of Kremenchug (Ukraine). He taught Russian and drawing. Already in the first year of his career, this young teacher tried to establish closer contact between school and family and to carry the school work beyond the conventional bounds of teaching routine.

In the turbulent revolutionary years 1905-07, Makarenko helped the railway workers to arrange their revolutionary meetings in the school building, took an active part in pre-

paring and conducting a congress of teachers employed at schools belonging to the railway, and read much of the political literature published by the Bolsheviks.

In 1911, Makarenko received an appointment to the primary school at Dolinskaya Station, about a hundred kilometres from Krivoi Rog, in the Ukraine. Here he displayed his gift for organisation more fully still: he introduced various after-school activities for the pupils, took them on trips to Moscow, St. Petersburg, Sevastopol and other cities, guided and encouraged them in their spare-time reading, arranged shows, quizzes, and so on. His own free time, and particularly the summer holidays, he devoted to self-improvement, reading, drawing and studying music.

In the autumn of 1914, with nine years' teaching practice behind him, Makarenko entered Poltava Pedagogical Institute. He read widely, made a profound study of pedagogics, and also tried his hand at poetry and short story writing. He graduated with honours in 1917 and went back to Kryukovo to teach at the same school where he began his career twelve years earlier.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution Makarenko's rare pedagogical talent developed to the full. The Department of Public Education put him in charge of a school with approximately a thousand pupils. Makarenko was one of the first to adopt the ideas of the new pedagogy, actively joined in the campaign for reshaping the old school into the Soviet school of the working people and applied many new methods in practice. With a view to uniting the pupils into a close-knit collective, he made the first attempts to organise their work by breaking them up into teams. Makarenko also initiated various after-school activities with great success. Amateur theatricals was one; he put on the shows himself and drew the teachers and parents into the work. He also started evening classes for eliminating illiteracy among the workers.

However, Makarenko was unable to carry on with his versatile activities at the Kryukovo school for long. Within

the year, due to the developments of the Civil War, he was compelled to move to Poltava where he was engaged from September 1919 to June 1920 setting up a new Soviet school.

At the Third All-Russia Congress of the Komsomol, held in Moscow in 1920, Lenin spoke on the tasks of the youth leagues. The propositions set out by him on the unseverable connection between Soviet education and communist construction, on the need to utilise in socialist construction all the best experience accumulated by mankind, and on the ways and means of inculcating communist morality, were adopted by Makarenko, his co-workers, and all Soviet teachers generally as a programme of communist education in the Soviet state.

In the autumn of 1920, the Department of Public Education entrusted Makarenko with the organisation of a colony near Poltava for homeless children and juvenile delinquents.

Within a few years this colony, called the Gorky Colony from 1921, developed into a wonderful educational establishment whose experience attracted the attention of teachers and educators for many years to come.

It was here that Makarenko, in the course of his practical activity, evolved his methods of educating new people, citizens of a socialist society. His experience at the Gorky Colony brought him to the firm conviction that the most powerful educative force was socially useful productive labour.

The productive labour of the colony inmates, limited at that time to farming and manual training, was combined with a balanced general development, political, physical and aesthetic education. Labour, which was originally introduced for a utilitarian purpose, soon became the basis of the whole educative process and the colony's centre of activity. The young Soviet republic, whose industry and agriculture were in a state of disintegration and decline caused by the long years of war and foreign intervention, was compelled to economise on absolutely everything to speed up rehabilitation. Little money could be afforded for the maintenance of

the colony, and so Makarenko, as its head, had a hard time to make ends meet.

In 1927, a commune for homeless children and adolescents was founded on the outskirts of Kharkov in commemoration of that great friend of children—Felix Dzerzhinsky.* Anton Makarenko was invited to head it.

He worked there for eight years, in the course of which the Dzerzhinsky Commune grew into a model educational establishment with a close-knit collective formed as a result of the practical application of his system, which he himself modestly called ordinary Soviet education.

Here again, as in the Gorky Colony, the accent was on productive labour which was having a most favourable influence on the one-time delinquents. At first they worked in school workshops which, however, were run like regular industrial enterprises according to a strictly laid down plan.

As a result of this serious approach to productive labour, the Commune became completely self-supporting and, by saving money, was eventually able to build two factories of their own—one manufacturing electric drills and the other photo cameras. Today, these cameras with the trademark FED (Felix Edmundovich Dzerzhinsky) are known throughout the world.

However, it would be a gross mistake to imagine that in organising this work Makarenko had only economical ends in view. The ideological and theoretical basis of his system was the Marxist teaching on the unity of physical, mental, moral and aesthetic education, the principle of combining school studies with productive labour in modern industry, as the only means of rearing harmoniously developed people. This explains why Makarenko chose for his charges such complex types of production as the manufacture of electric drills and photo cameras.

* As chairman of the commission for improving the life of children, under the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, Felix Dzerzhinsky took vigorous measures to right the situation as regards waifs and juvenile delinquents, and in general devoted a great deal of his time to the welfare of children.

Teaching the pupils several industrial skills to perfection and at the same time giving them a general education was, in fact, practising the Marxist principle of polytechnic education. And so Makarenko had every right to say in his article "Teachers Shrug Their Shoulders" (1932) that at the Dzerzhinsky Commune they did not know there was such a thing as a chasm between physical and mental work. The preparatory faculty of the Kharkov Machine-Building Institute, opened at the Dzerzhinsky Commune in 1930, trained the boys and girls for enrolment in higher educational establishments. Besides receiving a good grounding in general subjects, these future students also received the qualifications of highly skilled workers.

Direct participation in the production processes, work organisation and management of a complex modern enterprise, was a mighty character-building factor, cultivating in the young people such qualities as discipline, willpower, perseverance, a sense of collectivism and responsibility, ability to guide and obey, and also developing in them a respectful regard for manual labour.

The boys and girls worked five hours a day in production and had four hours of school. Efficient planning of the work and the school processes left them enough time for various other activities which furthered their physical development and cultural education. The Commune had about twenty permanent art and hobby circles: drama, painting, dancing, gymnastics, literary, glider model building, and others.

Among the different forms of non-scholastic educational work, a place apart belongs to the arrangement of annual trips during which the pupils gained a first-hand knowledge of their country's geography and economy. This knowledge enhanced their sense of patriotism and pride in their Motherland. They were taken to see the leading enterprises, met the best workers and themselves took part in the work. It goes without saying that the youngsters became the stronger and healthier for these long summer travels.

The experience of the Dzerzhinsky Commune attracted the attention of many foreign delegations which came to the Soviet Union in those years.

In the first five years of its existence the Commune was visited by 127 delegations from nearly thirty countries, including 37 delegations from Germany, 16 from France, 17 from Great Britain, 11 from South America, and 8 from the U.S.A. All of them expressed their admiration in the visitors' book.

This is what E. Herriot, a prominent French statesman, wrote after visiting the Dzerzhinsky Commune at the end of 1932: "I am overwhelmed.... Today, I saw a veritable miracle which I would never have believed had I not seen it with my own eyes."

In the summer of 1935 Makarenko was appointed assistant director of the Department of Labour Colonies of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, Ukrainian S.S.R. And although officially he remained head of the Dzerzhinsky Commune until 1937, he was no longer able to give it the whole of his attention.

At the end of January 1937, Makarenko moved to Moscow where he settled permanently and devoted himself entirely to writing.

His first big literary work was a collection of sketches entitled *1930 Marches On* (1932) in which he described the Commune. Encouraged and helped by Maxim Gorky, he published his famous *The Road to Life* (1933-35), which immediately placed him among the best writers of the day. This book, written in the form of a novel, brilliantly generalises the enormous educational work carried out at the Gorky Colony in those years.

In 1937 Makarenko published his *Book for Parents*. One may judge of its popularity from the fact that it has stood ten editions and to this day is widely read both in the Soviet Union and abroad.

Makarenko wrote a great number of articles on problems of education, book reviews, screenplays and stories.

His last big work was the novel *Learning to Live* (1938) describing the Dzerzhinsky Commune. It was closely linked with his first book *The Road to Life*, for the nucleus of the Commune was the group of former Gorky Colony pupils who came over with Makarenko.

He combined his literary work with numerous personal appearances before teachers and parents, with talks on problems of communist education, on his own experience, and on Soviet pedagogy generally.

But his fruitful and extremely diversified activity in Moscow came to an end too soon. Makarenko died on April 1, 1939, before he could complete the work he dreamed of publishing all his life—his scientifically substantiated "Methods of Communist Education".

* * *

Makarenko applied his theory of communist education in practice. In his system the experience of building up the Soviet school is generalised, and provision is made for prospects of its further development in the period of communist construction in the U.S.S.R.

The distinctive feature of his system is the active and purposeful process of education, embracing all aspects of the children's and adolescents' life and activity, and not stopping at schoolwork alone.

As Makarenko quite rightly asserts, pedagogy should have at its command all the various means of exerting a positive influence on the pupils, strong enough to overcome any harmful influence they might come up against. In other words, education should not be restricted to the class-room, it should influence the pupil's entire life, governing his behaviour both in a family environment and in the company of friends.

Makarenko's theoretical premises, just as the whole of his practical work, are permeated with the spirit of socialist humanism, a profound faith in man, and a love of children

and youth. The basic principle of his profoundly humane pedagogy has always been the observance of this rule: place the most exacting demands on a person and treat him with the utmost respect.

Guided by this principle, Makarenko attained unparalleled results in his work with juvenile delinquents, strays and children whose education had been neglected. He even insisted that difficult children as such did not exist.

In setting out his educational aims he proceeded from the Marxist-Leninist teaching on communist education which provides for the all-round development of personality. "I take the aim of education to mean the programme of a human personality, the programme of a human character, and into the concept 'character' I put all that a personality holds," said Makarenko.

Enlarging on this general formula, he wrote: "We want to bring up a cultured Soviet workingman. It follows therefore that we must give him an education, if possible a secondary school education, we must teach him a trade, we must discipline him and make him a politically developed and loyal member of the working class, the Komsomol and the Bolshevik Party. He must learn how to obey a comrade and how to give orders to a comrade. He must know how to be chivalrous, harsh, kind or ruthless, depending on circumstances. He must be an active organiser. He must have staying power, self-control and an ability to influence others. If he is punished by the collective he must defer to the collective, respect its decision and take his punishment. He must be cheerful, bright, smart in appearance, able to fight and to build, capable of living and loving life, and he must be happy. And that is the sort of person he must be not just in the future but right now, every day of his life."

Makarenko stressed the importance of cultivating such qualities as staunchness, purposefulness, ability to quickly size up a situation, efficiency and honesty. In particular he pointed out the necessity of cultivating patience and an ability to surmount difficulties over an extensive period. "You may

form any number of correct ideas about what has to be done, but if you do not instil in the child the habit of surmounting difficulties over an extensive period, you will have taught him nothing," he wrote.

In his pedagogical system Makarenko ascribed the greatest importance to productive labour, to the collective, and to personality. Correctly understanding Soviet education to mean collectivist education, he maintained that the way to organise it was to set up strong, influential collectives. The school was such a collective–a community of pupils and teachers headed and directed by the headmaster.

Makarenko disapproved of pedagogical methods which reduced education to the direct influence of the teacher on the pupil. Yet in his constant concern for the shaping, strengthening and steady development of the collective, he never lost sight of the child as a separate entity and always stressed the importance of educating the individual.

He worked out a new and original method of individual education, based on a fundamentally new approach to the relationship between the individual and the collective. Analysing his experience at the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune, Makarenko arrived at the conclusion that the connection between the collective and the individual should be not a direct link but contact maintained through the so-called primary collective, specially formed for educational purposes (detachment, team, class). This teaching on the primary collective is a big step forward in the development of pedagogy. A teacher may find its correct application a powerful ally.

What is a primary collective? According to Makarenko's definition it is a collective of people constantly associating with each other and united in business, friendship, communal interests and ideology.

In his experience the primary collective–in this case a detachment–played a part of enormous importance in influencing the individual. At the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune it was the primary collective with

which the bodies of self-government (such as the general meeting, the council of commanders and the Komsomol organisation) had dealings with mainly. It was the primary collective on which specific demands were made and which was held responsible for every one of its members.

The primary collective was very exacting towards any one of its members violating the norms of behaviour in any way. This collective influence produced a strong pedagogical effect. And it was this principle of "parallel action" on which Makarenko based his educational work.

Another point of importance stressed by him was that the primary collective should not be allowed to shut itself in within the circle of its own narrow interests. The danger of such an isolation is not excluded. Boys and girls working on the same team, going to the same form, or attending the same hobby circle obviously have their own particular interests which are liable to differ from those of the other primary collectives. Obsession with these private interests may cause the disintegration of the school collective, the loss of the common aim, and the ebbing of the general enthusiasm.

Ascribing great importance to the primary collective, Makarenko pointed out that a true collectivist can only be reared in a big collective that is closely linked with other big collectives. Real Soviet education can only be achieved when the entire collective of children, adolescents and teenagers regards itself as part of Soviet society.

This premise, put forward by Makarenko, is the axiom of the Soviet system of education. Every teacher, every educator is guided by it in his practical activity.

Makarenko, dwelling on the question of how a children's collective should be formed, pointed out that observance of the "law of a collective's movement" is one of the basic principles to be applied in order to organise a collective correctly and spur it to activity. A collective must always have an aim set before it, the attainment of which requires an effort. Involving all the pupils in a system of increasingly

complicated aims, attained through organised collective effort, is an essential condition for the development of a collective, for uniting it and making of it an educational factor.

Proceeding from the Marxist concept of "collective", Makarenko taught his pupils to co-ordinate their private interests and aspirations with the interests and aims of the collective.

From his point of view there can be no antagonism between them in conditions of Soviet society: private aims must stem from common aims. He always said that if the private aims of a children's collective are not determined by common aims, that particular collective is organised wrongly and the education effected in it cannot be called "really Soviet education".

Makarenko devoted a great deal of attention to such questions as the style and tone of a children's collective.

Style and tone are the outward forms in which the collective's activity is manifested and in which the observance of the norms of communist morality on the part of the majority of its members is reflected.

Style is the manifestation of a pupil's real and serious responsibility for any job entrusted to him and for his ability to control himself, to uphold his self-respect and preserve it whatever the circumstances.

The style of a Soviet children's collective, Makarenko used to say, should be characterised by a prevailing atmosphere of good cheer, smartness and a readiness for action at a moment's notice. Figuratively, Makarenko called the aggregate of all these characteristics "life in a major key", a state he regarded as a sign of the collective's calm confidence in its future.

While advocating the encouragement of this mood, Makarenko demanded at the same time that the children should be taught to decelerate, to use self-control, and learn not to violate the norms of cultured behaviour or break the established rules. He strongly disapproved of unbalanced behaviour,

holding that children should be taught to control their movements and their speech.

Among the educational means facilitating the upbuilding of a collective, he attributed a role of major importance to the emotional in the activity of children, and particularly to play. "In a children's collective there definitely must be play," he used to say. "A children's collective that does not play will never be a real children's collective. It helps to put the collective in a cheerful, vigorous mood, and makes the children ever ready to take up some useful activity, to do something interesting and intelligent."

As a means of cementing the collective, traditions came first with Makarenko. He maintained that true Soviet education could not be effected unless there was a close-knit collective pursuing the same goals, a collective that has stood the test of time, and has built up certain praiseworthy traditions. He considered the cultivation and maintenance of good school traditions a task of supreme educational importance.

He looked upon a pupil's ability to take and give orders to a comrade, as the case may be, a valuable trait in a collective-educated person. In this connection, his experience as an innovator appears extremely valuable to us: both at the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune he succeeded in creating a complex system of relations based on mutual subordination and mutual dependence, which served to rear strong-minded, disciplined people, who could both give and take orders.

Talking about the methods of building up relations of complex interdependence and the elaboration of these methods, we must mention Makarenko's big contribution to the theory and practice of children's self-government. In the first years after the establishment of Soviet power, when the old school was being broken up and the new school created, the question of the pupils' self-government was often tackled wrongly by placing school organisations in contraposition to the teaching staff. Makarenko's experience helped educators to arrive

at the correct solution. He showed both in his theoretical and practical work that one of the main functions of the staff, headed by the school principal, is to organise the children's collective and its self-government, which is one of the more effective means of training active and articulate members of a society. Self-government helps pupils to cultivate habits of organisation, to display willpower, consciousness and discipline in a collective. The prerequisites for this are a sense of independence and a clarity of purpose, supported by the teaching staff and the school's Komsomol and Young Pioneers organisations.

In order to organise educational work correctly there has to be a close-knit collective of teachers. Makarenko stressed again and again that success in shaping a children's collective, and more especially in rearing its individual members, can be achieved only if the educators act not singly but as a body, a strong collective united by commonness of views and convictions, where one helps the other.

If we take upbringing in a collective to be the main distinguishing feature of Makarenko's educational system, then the next in importance is his education-through-work principle. Only through joint, socially useful productive labour can the education of real Soviet citizens be achieved. Through nothing else but joint effort, work in a collective, mutual assistance and interdependence in work, can the right sort of relations be formed between people, a kinship with and an affectionate friendship for every working man and woman can be engendered, and a feeling of indignation and condemnation can be instilled against anybody who shirks work and lives at the expense of others. Work trains a youngster for productive endeavour and cultivates in him a correct attitude to other people. In work a person gains confidence in his own abilities, and from work he receives great satisfaction and joy.

Its social significance apart, work plays a role of enormous importance in a child's personal life, being the principal form of individual expression.

Work, as a means of all-round development for a person of communist society, must be creative and productive, it should be organised at enterprises with a high technical efficiency and it must be combined with school education. This is what Lenin said about it: "An ideal future society cannot be conceived without the combination of education with the productive labour of the younger generation: neither training and education without productive labour, nor productive labour without parallel training and education could be raised to the degree required by the present level of technology and the state of scientific knowledge."

Work in modern industry was Makarenko's principle vehicle of education and also the pivot around which the entire life of his pupils revolved. At the Dzerzhinsky Commune work was organised in such a way that it engendered in the boys and girls an awareness of its social purpose, an awareness that their endeavour was part of the Soviet people's common endeavour, an awareness that their efforts helped to build up their country's economic strength and contributed to the creation of the material and technical basis of socialism.

Analysing the experience of the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune, Makarenko pointed out that, as a means of education, labour should always be viewed in conjunction with the other means of that educational system, since "labour that does not go hand in hand with political and social education remains a neutral process of no educational value".

Makarenko held the "principle of perspectives" to be one of the main principles of Soviet education. Guided by it, he first elaborated and then with great skill and effect applied his system of perspectives in practice. He defined the essence of this system in the following words: "Man must have something joyful ahead of him to live for. The true stimulus in human life is the morrow's joy.... To educate a man is to furnish him with a perspective leading to the morrow's joy."

In pedagogical technique this is one of the most important objectives to be worked for. A collective of children must be furnished with new aims to strive for all the time, the achievement of which, while requiring a certain effort, will bring them joy.

The supreme aim of his system of perspectives was to instil collective and not merely personal ambitions in the children. They had to be made to feel with all their being the forward movement of their Motherland, her toil and her successes, and then they would see their own life as a component of the life of the whole society, and would struggle for a happier lot for everybody. In this way, collective perspectives would also become the personal perspectives of every single pupil.

Giving assignments to the pupils was something Makarenko set great store by, qualifying it as an exercise for the mind and the kind of activity that furthers the all-round development of an individual's gifts within the framework of a collective. These assignments should be feasible tasks, and the individual entrusted with them by the collective should be accountable to the collective who would also appraise his work.

In Makarenko's view, individual approach was an integral part of collective education. He stressed time and again that every individual in a collective had to be worked on with tact and subtlety to encourage the full unfolding of all his endowments and abilities. "Only the creation of a method—a general, single method which would at the same time give every person a chance to develop his individual traits and preserve his individuality—would be an organisational task worthy of our epoch and our revolution," Makarenko said. Every child presents a complex world of feelings and emotions. And the lofty mission of the educator is to gain access to this world, direct its development wisely, and make it the richer for great ideals.

Makarenko's experience gives us a wonderful example of how to build up the character of children and teenagers,

shape their world outlook, and instil in them the finest moral qualities. From the one-time strays and juvenile delinquents he had in his charge, he reared some 3,000 new people, new in the full sense of the word—honest, devoted Soviet patriots with a high sense of their socialist duty, people with a will and initiative, well disciplined and industrious.

He ranked such questions as discipline, regimen, reward and punishment with the more important problems of school upbringing, to be regarded as components of the entire system of education.

First of all it should be said that Makarenko gave a new definition to the concept of discipline from the standpoint of a Soviet educationist. Whereas traditional bourgeois pedagogy regards discipline as merely a means of inculcating humility and obedience, he regarded it as a result of education. "Discipline is the product of the aggregate of educational influences, which comprises the school education process, the political education process, the process of character building, of encountering and settling clashes and conflicts within the collective, of forming friendships and establishing relations of mutual trust—in short, everything that an educative process can cover, including physical education, physical development, and so on."

Soviet discipline in Makarenko's understanding is the discipline of overcoming obstacles, the discipline of struggle and advance, the discipline of striving for something, fighting for something. "Our discipline," he said, "is a blend of a full awareness of duty and a perfectly clear understanding, shared by everyone, of how to act, while preserving a clear-cut, precise outward form which brooks no argument, disagreement, objection, procrastination or talk."

While asserting that discipline is built up through the skilful organisation of a collective, he pointed out the need to explain the rules and ethical norms of Soviet behaviour to the pupils in a convincing and understandable way in order to be able to demand their observance of these rules.

25-8-75

He considered a teacher's ability to make demands on his pupils an important requirement of pedagogical skill. In making his demands, the teacher should be justly strict and uncompromising. To achieve the desired educational impact he should state his demands in a firm, businesslike tone, impressing the pupils with his strong will, culture and personality.

The forms may differ. A milder form can be applied in cases where peculiarities of character, lack of restraint and ignorance of ethical norms are present, because here it is fairly reasonable to expect the influence of experience to have a positive effect and good habits to be gradually acquired. But in cases where the individual deliberately opposes the collective, defying its requirements and its power, the teacher must make determined demands, following them through to the end until that individual recognises that he must obey the collective.

Reward and punishment played a notable part among the great variety of means applied by Makarenko in his educational work. He maintained that only in conditions of trust and confidence in the individual's good qualities could such means as reward and punishment produce the desired educational effect. Both should be well considered and used sparingly. In every single case their significance should be made clear to the collective as a whole and to every one of its members.

In his opinion, regimen is the code of everyday life, a means of establishing order and of setting the rhythm for the collective's activity. Accumulating sound disciplinary experience and establishing the general pattern of behaviour are the principal aims to be served. To obtain the best educational effect, regimen must be expedient, based on the experience of the entire collective, precise and compulsory for all its members.

Makarenko pointed out repeatedly that a fixed, unvarying pattern is inadmissible in educational work. He qualified pedagogy as the most dialectical, mobile, complex and many-

sided of sciences. Educational means must be suited to circumstances, for the same means may prove good in one case and bad in another. In educational work no means can be put down as either good or bad if considered apart from other means, from the entire system, from the aggregate of educative influences.

The work of an educator is both difficult and delicate, since it is not just children collectively that he has to deal with, but a number of different individuals each with his own inclinations, level of development, abilities and personality. Therefore, every lesson, every encounter with a pupil, every conversation alone with a pupil, are small etudes in an educator's creative work. Everything is taken into account here—the purpose of the conversation, the circumstances under which it takes place, the level of the collective's intellectual development, and the individual peculiarities of the pupil.

Makarenko's thoughts on the craftsmanship of teachers are of interest and value. He said that pedagogical skill was by no means a natural gift, a person is not born with it, he attains it through study, training, experience and constant self-improvement. In his opinion, the traits essential to excellence are: a faculty for quick orientation, self-control, calm confidence, and an ability to influence effectively not just the collective as a whole but every one of its members taken separately. Makarenko said that teachers should, while still at college, get their voices trained—the voice being the main instrument in teaching work—and perfect such techniques as control of facial expression, gesture and pose when facing a class-room of children, manner of address in different situations, etc.

When delivering his lectures and talks to teachers, Makarenko always spoke with great warmth and tact of the teacher's toil and his difficult and honourable role of embarking the young generation on the road to life. His manner of addressing the teachers was very simple, he never put himself above them or claimed the right to preach to them.

Rather the contrary, he was anxious to learn from his colleagues because he was certain their experience contained much that was interesting and enlightening.

* * *

A. S. Makarenko's lectures included in the book under the general title "Problems of Soviet School Education" give the views of this innovator in pedagogy on questions that agitate pedagogical circles today. Some of these views remain as topical today, although they were voiced almost thirty years ago.

Candidates of Pedagogical Science
V. ARANSKY and A. PISKUNOV

PROBLEMS OF SOVIET SCHOOL EDUCATION

LECTURE ONE

Methods of Upbringing

The subject of our talk today is upbringing. Only remember, comrades, that I am a practising educator and so there will inevitably be a somewhat practical bias in my words. But in this present epoch, practical workers are introducing some wonderful amendments into the premises of the different sciences. With us in the Soviet Union such workers are called Stakhanovites. We know how many amendments the Stakhanovites, the practical workers, have introduced into many of the premises of sciences which are more precise than our science, and how many records they have set in labour productivity, in labour efficiency generally and in their own special field particularly. It is not simply by increasing the expenditure of labour energy that productivity is rising, but by practising a new approach to work, by applying a new logic and by distributing the elements of labour in a new way. It follows, therefore, that labour productivity is growing with the help of inventions, discoveries and finds.

Our field of production–the field of education–can by no means be excluded from this general Soviet movement. And in our field as well–it is my profound and lifelong conviction–inventions are as necessary, even inventions of details, even of trifles, and the more so of groups of details in the system and in parts of the system. These inventions, of course, are welcome not just from the theorists but also from

ordinary rank-and-file workers like myself. That is why I permit myself to tell you, without feeling too shy about it, of my experience and of the conclusions I have drawn from this experience, believing as I do that in significance they should be placed on a level with similar amendments contributed by practical workers to certain achievements of theory.

What store of knowledge have I that I make bold to address you?

Many believe that I am an expert in dealing with juvenile delinquents and homeless children. That is not true. Out of my thirty-two years of work I spent sixteen teaching school and sixteen educating homeless children and adolescents. True, there were some special circumstances in my teaching career—the school I taught was maintained by a factory and was under the constant influence of a workers' community, a community of Bolsheviks.

Nor was my work with the homeless by any manner of means special work with homeless waifs. In the first place, from the very outset, I made it my working hypothesis that no special methods were to be applied in their case; in the second, I succeeded in a very short space of time to bring the homeless waifs up to standard, and thereafter I was able to work with them as with normal children.

In the last period of my work at the Dzerzhinsky Commune near Kharkov, I already had a normal collective, attending ten-year school, and striving for the usual goals our conventional schools strive for. The members of this collective, the one-time waifs, did not really differ in any respect from normal children. If they did, it was for the better, I think, since life in this working collective provided more educational stimuli than even a family environment could give a child. Therefore, my practical conclusions may be applied not to the homeless, difficult children alone, but to any children's collective, and consequently to anyone working in the field of education.

So much for my introductory observations, which I would ask you to make note of.

And now, a few words about the very character of my practical, pedagogical logic. I came to certain conclusions, arriving there neither painlessly nor quickly, but on the contrary after going through several stages of rather tormenting doubts and errors. These conclusions may sound strange to some of you, but I have ample supporting evidence to tell you about them without any undue modesty. Some of these conclusions have a theoretical character. I shall enumerate them briefly before going on to describe my own experience.

The very character of the science of upbringing is an interesting question in itself. A conviction exists among the pedagogical thinkers of our time and also among those who organise our pedagogical work that no special methods of upbringing are needed at all; that teaching methods, the methods of teaching a school subject, should include educational thought in its entirety as well. I do not agree with this. I maintain that the science of upbringing, I mean pure upbringing, is a separate field, quite distinct from teaching methods.

The following makes me firmly convinced that this is so. In the Soviet Union, not just the tiny tots and schoolchildren but all adult citizens are subjected to educative influences at every step. They are subjected to them either in specially organised forms, or in the form of a broad public stimulant. With us, in our country, our every undertaking, every campaign, every process, apart from pursuing special aims, is invariably accompanied by educational aims as well. It is sufficient to recall our recent Supreme Soviet elections*: this was educational work at its greatest, involving tens of millions of people, even those who would seem to have nothing to do with educational work, even the most passive were brought to the fore and drawn into active work. I want to emphasise the successes scored by the Red Army in its

* Reference is made to the 1937 elections to the Supreme Soviet, the highest organ of state power in the Soviet Union.

educational work: you know very well that every person who has served in the Red Army comes home a new man, not simply equipped with new military and political knowledge, but a man with a new character, new ways, and a new type of behaviour, which is achieved through the enormous efforts of Soviet socialist education, a single whole in tone, style and content, furnished, of course, with a definite educational method. We can already make a summing up of this method which has been practised for twenty years under the Soviet government. And if we add to it the educational achievements of our schools, our institutes, and our organisations of another type–kindergartens and children's homes, we shall see that we have accumulated a vast store of experience in educational work.

As a matter of fact, if we took the tried and tested, established and precisely formulated list of educational means, plus the assertions and propositions of our Party and the Komsomol, and the views expressed by Comrade Lenin, we would already now be fully able to compile a workable, comprehensive code of all the theorems and axioms of the educational set-up in the U.S.S.R.

In my experience I was obliged to make upbringing my main goal. Since I was entrusted with the reformation of the so-called juvenile delinquents, my primary task was to give them a moral education. No one even thought of setting before me the task of educating them in the sense of book-learning. I was given boys and girls–juvenile delinquents or strays–with much too unconventional and dangerous traits of character, and what I was expected to do above all else was to remould that character.

At first it seemed that I would have to concentrate on their moral education as a separate sort of subject, and in particular on their work education. I myself did not hold this extreme view too long, but my colleagues at the Dzerzhinsky Commune supported it for quite a long time. In some communes, even at the NKVD (under the old administration) this remained the prevailing policy.

The pursuit of this policy was helped along by a seemingly admissible assertion that attending school should be a matter of choice: those who wished could come and study, those who didn't need not. What it actually ended in was that no one took school seriously. A bad mark or some other unpleasantness in class left the pupil free to immediately claim his right to give up school.

It did not take me long to become convinced that in the system of labour colonies school is a powerful vehicle of moral education. In the last years of my work I was persecuted by certain Labour Colony Department workers for upholding this principle. I made the ten-year school my basis, and I am firmly convinced that real reformation, complete reformation that is proof against any relapses, can only be achieved with the help of a full ten-year school, but still, even now, I remain of the opinion that methods of upbringing have a logic of their own, relatively independent from the logic of teaching methods. In my view, the one and the other–education and teaching methods–are two more or less independent branches of pedagogy. Needless to say, these two branches have to be linked organically. And, needless to say, all work done in class is, in effect, educational work. But reducing education to book-learning is something I consider out of the question. Further on I shall dwell on this point in more detail.

And now a few words on what can be taken as a basis of educational methods.

To begin with, I am convinced that educational methods cannot be evolved from what is suggested by adjacent sciences, no matter how far developed such sciences as psychology and biology, the latter especially after Pavlov's*

---

* Ivan Petrovich Pavlov (1849-1936)–the outstanding Russian physiologist, Academician and Nobel Prize winner, who founded the teaching on the higher nervous activity. His major works are: *Twenty Years of Objective Study of the Higher Nervous Activity (Behaviour) of Animals* (1922), *Lectures on the Work of the Cerebral Hemispheres* (1927).

achievements, may be. I am convinced that deriving an educational means directly from these sciences' findings is something we have not the right to do. These sciences should play a vastly important part in educational work as control propositions for verifying our practical achievements, but by no means as prerequisites for a conclusion.

Moreover, I consider that an educational means can only be evolved from experience, and then verified and approved by such sciences as psychology and biology.

This assertion of mine is based on the following: pedagogy, and in particular the theory of education, is above all else a science of practical expediency. We cannot educate a person unless we have a clear-cut political aim in view. If we don't, we have not the right to take up educational work at all. Educational work that does not pursue a clear, far-reaching and minutely studied aim, is education without a political purpose, and we find evidence proving this at every step in our Soviet public life. The Red Army is making a great, an enormous success of its educational work, quite outstanding, really, in world history. This success is so great, so enormous, because the Red Army's methods are always expedient, and the Red Army educators always know what sort of people they want to bring up and what goal they want to attain. Now the best example of inexpedient pedagogical theory is the lately deceased pedology.* In this sense pedology may be regarded as the exact opposite of Soviet education. It was a system not furnished with an aim.

Wherefrom can the aims of education arise? From our social needs, of course, from the aspirations of the Soviet people, from the aims and tasks of our revolution, from the aims and problems of our struggle. And so, obviously, a formula of aims cannot be derived from either biology or

* In the late 1920s and middle 1930s, pedological ideas became rather popular with a part of the Soviet pedagogues and psychologists. A. S. Makarenko was sharply opposed to pedology, maintaining that it hindered the development of the Marxist teaching on education.

psychology, but only from our social history, from our social environment.

And I think that we should not make such claims on biology and psychology and seek in them a confirmation of our teaching methods. They are developing, and before the next ten years are out both psychology and biology will probably set out precise propositions on human behaviour, and then we shall be able to base our work on these sciences. The attitude of our social needs and the social aims of socialist education to the aims and findings of the theory of psychology and biology must always go on changing, and maybe the change will even involve the constant participation of psychology and biology in our educational work. But what I am convinced in firmly is that a pedagogical means cannot be derived from either psychology or biology simply by deductive logic. I have already said that pedagogical means must be originally derived from our social and political aims.

It is my belief that it was in the matter of setting an aim, in the matter of expediency, that pedagogical theory was mostly at fault. All the mistakes, all the deviations in our pedagogical work always occurred where the logic of expediency was concerned. Let us call them mistakes for reference.

I see three types of such mistakes in pedagogical theory: deductive statements, ethical fetishism and isolated means.

In my practical activity I suffered greatly from trying to overcome these mistakes. Someone would pick on a method and assert that it would have such and such an effect. For example, take the story of the complex method,* which is well known to all of you. Someone would recommend a method–in this case the complex method of teaching, and

---

* A system widely practised in Soviet schools in the 1920s, whereby the study material on various subjects was united to make single themes. Experience showed that a teaching method such as this gave the pupils no chance to acquire systematic knowledge on the basic sciences and prevented them from cultivating essential learning habits.

deduct speculatively, by means of logic, that this method must bring about good results.

And so the effect–the good results of the complex method–became established before experience had proved it so. But established it nevertheless was that the result would definitively be good; that the desired effect would be hiding in some secret places of the psyche.

When we, the modest practical educators, asked to be shown this good result, we were told: "How can we show you what's inside a human soul, it's there that the good result must be, it's complex harmony, the connection of parts. The connection between the separate parts of a lesson must surely leave a positive impression on a person's mentality."

In other words, even logic precluded this method from being put to the test. And a vicious circle was formed: the method was good, therefore the result must be good, and since the result was good, the method must be good.

Mistakes such as this, resulting from the prevalence of deductive logic and not experimental logic, were many.

There were also many mistakes of the so-called ethical fetishism type. For example, take labour education.

I, too, was one of those who made that mistake. The very word "labour" sounds so pleasant, it holds so much that to us is sacred and justified, that the concept "labour education" appeared to us absolutely precise, definite and correct. And then we discovered that the word "labour" as such does not contain anything like the only correct, finished logic. At first, work was regarded as ordinary work, what may be termed as self-service, and then as an aimless labour process, as unproductive labour–an exercise in the waste of muscle power. The word "labour" so illumined the logic that it appeared infallible, although it was revealed at every step that there was no genuine infallibility. But belief in the ethical power of the term itself was so strong that the logic, too, seemed sacred. And yet my own experience and the experience of my teacher friends has shown that no educative means can be evolved from the ethical colouring of a term,

that labour as applicable to education can be organised in different ways and that it can bring about a different result in every separate case. At any rate, labour that does not go alongside of school education, that does not go alongside of social and political education, remains a neutral process of no educational value. You can make a person work as much as you want, but unless he receives a political and moral education at the same time, unless he takes part in public and political life, this work will be no more than a neutral process that yields no positive results.

Work can be a means of education only if it is part of a general system.

And, last but not least, the mistake of the "isolated means" type. Very often people say that such and such a means unfailingly brings about such and such a result. One particular means. Let us take an assertion which at first glance seems to be the most indisputable one and which is often voiced in pedagogical writings—the question of punishment. Punishment educates a slave—this is a precise axiom which has never been subjected to doubt. This assertion, of course, contains all the three mistakes. There is the mistake of the deductive prediction type, and the ethical fetishism type. In punishment, the logic stems from the very colouring of that word. And, last but not least, there is the mistake of the "isolated means" type. And yet I am convinced that no means can be considered in isolation from a system. No means whatever can be pronounced good or bad if it is considered apart from other means, from a whole complex of influences. Punishment may educate a slave, but sometimes it may also educate a very good person, a very free and proud person. In my own experience, you will be surprised to hear, punishment was also among the means I resorted to when I was confronted with the task of inculcating dignity and self-respect in my charges.

I will tell you afterwards in what cases punishment results in the cultivation of human dignity. Obviously, this effect can be achieved only in a definite environment of other means

and at a definite stage of development. No pedagogical means, not even a universally accepted means–which is what we usually call persuasion, explanation, talk, and public influence–can be termed a perfect and invariably useful means. The best of means is sure to be the worst of means sometimes. Take a means like collective influence, that is the influence of the collective on the individual. Sometimes it will be good and sometimes bad. Take individual approach, the heart-to-heart talk of teacher with pupil. Sometimes it will be beneficial and sometimes harmful. No means can be regarded from the point of view of its usefulness or harmfulness if it is considered apart from the entire system of means. And finally, no system of means can be recommended as a standing system.

I recall the history of the Dzerzhinsky Commune. This Commune, set up in 1928, grew up as a collective of boys and girls not older than eighth-form pupils (that is, 15 or 16). It was a healthy, jolly collective, but it was a far cry from the collective of 1935 with its big Komsomol organisation and its veteran communards, some as old as twenty years of age. Obviously, a collective such as the latter called for an entirely different system of education.

Personally I am convinced of the following: if we took an ordinary Soviet school and placed it in the hands of good teachers, organisers and educators for twenty years, it would travel such a long and wonderful way in that time–provided it was retained in good pedagogical hands–that at the end of this road the system of education would differ greatly from what it had been at the start.

By and large, pedagogy is the most dialectical, mobile, complex and diversified of sciences. This assertion makes the credo of my pedagogical faith. I am not trying to say that I have verified everything there is to verify in practice, far from it, because I am still not clear on very many points, but I do advance it as a working hypothesis which at any rate deserves to be put to the test. I personally have the proof of my experience, but of course it needs putting to the

test in extensive Soviet social practice. By the way, I am convinced that the logic of what I have said is not incompatible with the experience of our best Soviet schools nor that of very many of our best children's and adult collectives.

So much for my general preliminary observations on which I wished to dwell.

Let us now pass to the most important question, that of setting up educational goals. By whom, when and how can educational goals be set, and what exactly are educational goals?

I take the concept "educational goal" to mean the programme of a personality, the programme of a character, and what is more I put into the concept "character" all that a personality holds, that is, the nature of his outward manifestations, his inner convictions, his political education and his knowledge—the picture of a human personality in its entirety. I maintain that we, pedagogues, should have such a programme of human personality towards which we must strive.

I could not do without a programme like that in my practical work. There's no teacher like experience. In that same Dzerzhinsky Commune I was given a few hundred people, and in every one of those people I saw deep-rooted and dangerous urges, deep-rooted habits, and I had to stop and think: what should their character be like, what must I strive for in order to mould these boys and girls into worthy citizens? And when I began to ponder over it I discovered that this question could not be answered in a brief two words. The notion—to mould a good Soviet citizen—did not yet show me the way. I had to work out a more comprehensive programme of human personality. And, as I began to tackle it, I came up against the following question: this programme now, must it be the same for everybody? Why, am I supposed to wedge every personality into a single programme, trim them to a pattern and strive for this pattern? If so, I must sacrifice the individual charm, the originality and the peculiar beauty of personality, because if I don't what sort of a

pattern will I get? I could not simply go and answer this question as an abstract problem, but then it was solved for me in practice in the course of ten years.

I discovered that indeed there must be a general programme, a pattern, and also an individual amendment to it. The question did not arise for me: should my pupil grow up a courageous man or should I bring up a coward? A pattern was in order here: every one of my pupils had to grow up a brave, staunch, honest and industrious patriot. But what line to take when you have to deal with such delicate aspects of a personality as talent? And sometimes when it comes to talent, when you are confronted by it, you do have to suffer some tormenting doubts. I had a case like that. The boy, Terentyuk his name was, finished ten-year school. He was an excellent pupil, all his marks were fives (we had a best of five system), and upon graduation he announced that he wished to enrol at a technological institute. I had earlier discovered in him a great gift for acting, and it was the gift of a singularly powerful comedian, extremely subtle, sharp-witted, skilled by nature in mimicry and endowed with splendid vocal chords—an intelligent sort of comedian, I mean. I saw that an actor's career was where he would attain the best results, and that he'd be no more than an average student at a technological institute. But all my boys wanted to become engineers, it was the craze of the time. They'd laugh in your face if you so much as intimated that they might become, say, teachers: "How do you mean? Become a teacher purposely?" I said to Terentyuk: "Go on the stage." And he: "Oh no, is that work, being an actor?" And so he went and enrolled at a technological institute, leaving me profoundly convinced that we were losing a fine actor. I gave in, for after all I had no right to make a wrench like that in a person's life....

But still I couldn't help interfering. He had been studying at the institute for six months then, and in his spare time had been attending our amateur theatricals circle. I thought and thought about it, and then I made up my mind: I sum-

moned Terentyuk to a general meeting, and announced that I was putting in a complaint against him for disobedience. Our boys and girls said to him: "Aren't you ashamed of yourself, why don't you do what you're told?" And they passed a resolution that he should leave the technological institute and join the school of theatrical art instead. He went about looking very sad for a while, but he could not go against the collective, for it was the collective that paid him a monthly maintenance grant and gave him a place to live. He has become a splendid actor, he is already playing in one of the best theatres in the Far East, having in two years traversed the road others only traverse in ten. And he is very grateful to me now.

Still, if I were confronted with a similar problem now, I should be afraid to solve it—how can I know if I have the right to commit this violence? The question of whether a person has the right to tamper with a pupil's chosen career remains unsolved for me. But I am profoundly convinced that every teacher will be confronted by this question—has he the right to interfere in the development of a character and guide it in the correct direction, or must he passively look on? To my mind, the question should be answered in the affirmative—yes, he has that right. But how to go about it? In every separate case the question has to be approached individually, because it's one thing to have the right, and another to exercise it properly. They are two different problems. And it's very possible that a time will come when teaching people how to perform this operation will play a part of paramount importance in the training of our educators. After all, a surgeon is taught how to trepan the skull. And with us, a teacher will perhaps be taught how to perform this "trepanation"—more tactfully, more successfully, than I had done, perhaps, and they'll be taught how to guide a person in the best direction by making the most of his inherent qualities, leanings and abilities.

I shall now set out those practical forms which in my experience and the experience of my colleagues were applied

with the greatest success in our educational work. I regard the collective as the supremely important form of educational work. Pedagogical literature would seem to contain a great deal about the collective, but somehow the writings carry little conviction.

What is a collective and how far can we interfere with it? I am making observations of very many schools both here in Moscow and in Kiev where I often go now and have often gone in the past, and I do not always see a real collective of pupils. Occasionally I do see a *class-room* collective, but I have hardly ever seen a *school* collective.

I shall now tell you in a few simple words about my collective, reared by my friends and myself. You must remember, though, that the conditions I worked under were unlike those of an ordinary school, because in my case the pupils worked in our own factory, they lived in, and in the overwhelming majority had no parents, in other words they had no other collective. And so naturally I had more means of collective education available to me than a school teacher has. But I am not inclined to put it down to conditions alone. At one time I was headmaster of an ordinary school where the pupils were children of railway workers, or rather workers of a factory where railway coaches were built, and there, too, I had them knitted into a *school* collective.

There are some very strange things happening in school practice, which in its time was directed by the old leadership of the People's Commissariat of Education, things that are quite incomprehensible to my pedagogical soul. To clarify. I was in one of the recreation parks yesterday, a park with its own Palace of Young Pioneers. In the same district there is a Pavlik Morozov House,* it's a separate building. And in that same district there are thirteen schools. Yesterday I

---

* Pavlik Morozov, fourteen-year-old Young Pioneer, son of a poor peasant, fought heroically against the kulaks in his home village during the period of collectivisation. The kulaks murdered him in 1932. A large number of Young Pioneer squads and palaces bear Pavlik Morozov's name.

saw how those three institutions–the school, the Palace of Young Pioneers and the Pavlik Morozov House–pull the children about from one collective to another. The children have no collective. During school hours they belong to one collective, at home to another one, at the Palace of Young Pioneers to a third one, and at the Pavlik Morozov House to a fourth. They drift from one collective to another, choosing one in the morning, a different one at lunchtime, and still a different one at night. I witnessed the following scene yesterday: the Palace of Young Pioneers has a dance circle, it's called the rhythmics circle in a somewhat old-fashioned way, actually, it's just dancing. The Komsomol organiser of one of the schools declared: "We shan't allow our girls to attend that circle." The headmaster of the school was indignant: "Can you imagine it? The Komsomol organiser has declared that he won't let the girls attend!" The headmaster dragged the Komsomol organiser to a public hearing. "Look what he's doing!" And the Komsomol organiser stuck to his guns: "I said I wouldn't and I won't." A conflict. And I remembered a conflict of a similar type we had at our Commune. We ran a great variety of hobby circles, very serious study circles too, we had real gliders, and a cavalry section.... Well, one boy, a very good boy, a Young Pioneer, joined the Kharkov Palace of Young Pioneers through his Pioneer organisation and there took part in Arctic studies, doing so well that the Palace awarded him a prize–a trip to Murmansk with a group of other boys. This boy, Misha Peker his name was, came back to the Commune and told everyone that he was going to Murmansk.

"Where's this you're going?" one of the older boys asked.

"Murmansk."

"Who'll let you?"

"I'm being sent by the Palace."

At a general meeting the older members of the Commune demanded an explanation from Misha–who was sending him and where.

"I'm going to Murmansk to explore the Arctic, and I'm being sent by the Palace of Young Pioneers," Misha told them.

There was a general outcry.

"How dare the Palace send you anywhere! And supposing we want you to go on an assignment to Africa or something tomorrow? We're planning a trip down the Volga and you're our clarinetist, but even if you couldn't play the clarinet what's the big idea playing both sides? Serving two masters, that's what you're doing. No, you're not going anywhere. You ought to have asked the general meeting's permission to accept all those prizes and things."

Misha obeyed the general meeting. But the Young Pioneer and Komsomol organisations, and also the Palace of Young Pioneers found out, and there was talk: "What's going on at the Dzerzhinsky Commune? We're sending a person to the Arctic, and here they tell him: no, you're not going, you've got to stay and play the clarinet because we're planning a trip down the Volga." The matter was taken all the way to the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Komsomol Organisation. But it was settled without any trouble. Members of the Commune's Komsomol organisation said: "If Misha must go, we won't hold him by main force, of course, we'll give him his monthly grant and everything, and if he wishes he may join the Palace and stay there.... And if need be, we ourselves will send anyone we want to the Arctic to make the necessary investigations and we'll do our share to help in the exploration of the North Pole. At the present time our plans do not include it, that's all." And to Misha: "So what if Schmidt* does this and Schmidt does that! Everybody in the Soviet Union can't go to the North Pole, and so it's no use arguing that it's everybody's business to go exploring the North Pole!" Evidently Misha meant to argue, but they told

* Otto Schmidt (1891-1956)—prominent Soviet mathematician, astronomer and geophysicist, Hero of the Soviet Union. From 1929 to 1938 he headed more than one expedition to explore the Arctic regions of the U.S.S.R.

him: "All right now, you've done enough talking." And then he said: "I don't want to go myself now."

And here's another question. I've been to several summer camps near Moscow. They're good camps, it's a pleasure to stay at one and, of course, they're wonderful health-building establishments. But what surprised me was that children from different schools come there, and that's something I can't understand. I believe that in a way it upsets the harmony of education. A boy belongs to one school collective, but his summer holidays he spends in a mixed collective. It means that his school collective plays no part in organising his summer holidays. And there you are: one senses a friction in the Palaces of Young Pioneers and elsewhere, and I know what causes this friction.

Correct Soviet education must be organised by forming united, strong and influential collectives. The school must be a single collective where all the educative processes are properly organised. Every separate member of the collective should feel his dependence on the collective, he should be devoted to the interests of the collective, he should uphold these interests and value them above all else. But a situation in which every separate member of a collective is free to find associates for himself after his own taste, without using his collective's help and means to do so, I consider not right. The Young Pioneer Palaces in all our towns are doing excellent work, and those in Moscow especially. We may applaud the efforts of very many of the workers and the methods of work they practise. But while they are doing such an excellent job and our society helps them in this, it gives some of our schools a chance to dodge any extra work. Many of the schools do not trouble to start hobby circles because pupils can attend them at the Palaces of Pioneers. And, certainly, excuses can always be found: either they have no suitable premises or no funds, or again no instructors to run these circles, and so on and so forth. I am all for a collective where the entire educative process is properly organised.

Personally, I see it as a system of strong, powerful, well-

equipped and fully armed collectives. But these are only the external requirements of a well-organised collective....

The same Palace of Young Pioneers, or in other words the children's club, can work alongside the school, but the work should anyway be organised by the school. The school should be answerable for this work, and it has got to be a joint effort. The Komsomol organiser who was against the girls attending the rhythmics circle was right. If he is responsible for the upbringing of the children in his collective, he must take an interest in and be answerable for what his charges do in the Palace of Young Pioneers. This breaking up of the educative process among different institutions and persons, bound by no mutual responsibility or authority, can serve no useful purpose.

I do realise that a single children's collective, excellently equipped and armed, would naturally cost more money to maintain, but it is very possible that in the long run it would prove to be the more economical, if efficiently organised.

All this concerns the pattern of collectives as such. In short, I am inclined to insist that the role of a single collective, guiding children in their education, must belong to the school. And all the other institutions must be subordinated to the school.

I am convinced that if a collective has no set goal, it is hopeless to try and organise it. Every collective must have a common collective goal, set not before the separate forms, but before the whole school, which is absolutely essential.

My collective numbered five hundred people. Their ages ranged from eight to eighteen, in other words, it included pupils from the first to the tenth forms. They obviously differed from one another in a great many things. The older ones were better educated, more skilled in industrial work, and more cultured. The youngest were, of course, illiterate and closer to the definition "strays". In the final count, they were simply children. Nevertheless, in the last years of my work all the five hundred made up a genuinely single-minded collective. I never permitted myself to deny any one of my

charges his rights as a member of the collective or his vote, irrespective of his age or development. The general meeting of the Commune members was indeed a real governing body.

It was this idea of the general meeting functioning as the governing body that aroused the protests and doubts of my critics and chiefs. They said: You can't allow such a large general meeting to make decisions, you can't trust the management of a collective to a crowd of youngsters. They were right, of course. But then my whole point was to get those children to be not just a crowd, but a general meeting of members of a collective.

There are countless ways and means of changing a "crowd" into a general meeting. It can't be done by any artificial means, nor can it be achieved in one month. This is one of those cases when a striving for quick results invariably ends in failure. Take a school where there is no sort of collective, no co-ordination, where at best a form lives a life apart and comes together with the other forms the way we come together with the passers-by in the street. To shape a collective out of this amorphous collection of children would, naturally, be a long and difficult job (taking more than just a year or two). But then if a collective has once been shaped, if it is kept whole, well looked after and has its development closely watched, it can live for ages. And especially in school, where a child spends eight or ten years, such a collective must be treasured as the most powerful instrument of education.

A children's collective is a mighty force; in power it is practically unsurpassed, yet it can easily be broken up, of course. A sequence of errors, a series of changes in the guidance may reduce it to a "crowd." But the longer a collective lives, the stronger it grows, the keener it becomes to go on living.

And now we come to one very important condition, which I should like to stress particularly. Tradition. Nothing cements a collective so strongly as tradition. Cultivating traditions and instilling respect for them is an extremely important

part of educational work. A school that lacks traditions cannot be a good school, and the best schools I have seen, in Moscow too, are those that have built some up. What is a tradition? I have met with opposition in the matter of traditions as well. Our old educationists used to say: "Every law, every rule should be sensible and logically clear. And you are bringing in tradition, the sense and logic of which have long disappeared." Quite right, I did bring in tradition. Here's an example. When I was younger and had less work to do, I used to get up at 6 in the morning every day and make a roll-call: that is, I went to the dormitory together with the detachment commander on duty, and my coming was saluted with the order "Attention!" I took the roll-call of the commune members and made my morning check-up. I was the commune's Commanding Officer to them then, and as such I could examine any disputes that needed settling and mete out punishments. No one in the Commune except me had the right to impose punishment, that is barring the general meeting, of course. When I was no longer able to take the roll-call personally every day I told my charges that thereafter the commander on duty would do it in my place.

Gradually this became a routine procedure. And so a tradition was established: when taking the roll-call the commander on duty had the authority of a commanding officer, and his word was law. With time, the original reason was forgotten. Newcomers to the Commune knew that the duty officer was empowered to impose punishment but they did not know why. The old ones remembered of course. The duty officer would tell them: "Two fatigues for you." And they'd answer: "Yes, sir." But if the same duty officer had tried to exercise this right at any other time of the day, they would have said to him: "And who're you to give us orders?" It became a fixed tradition, and it did much to cement the collective.

We had very many of these traditions in my collective, virtually hundreds of them. I didn't know them all, but the

boys and girls did. They knew them even if they weren't recorded, they used their feelers or something to detect them. "Is this correct behaviour?" They would ask themselves. "Why? Because our elders behave this way." Copying the experience of their elders, respecting the elders' logic, respecting their endeavour to build up the Commune, and, most important, respecting the rights of the collective and its representatives—these are vastly important attitudes and they are, of course, upheld by tradition. The life of the children is made the more beautiful for these traditions. Living as they do within this pattern of traditions, they take a personal pride in these special laws peculiar to their own collective and try to perfect them.

To my mind, correct Soviet education cannot do without traditions. Nor can it be achieved unless a strong self-respecting collective of pupils has been built up with a dignity of its own.

I could name very many interesting traditions, but I will only mention a few as instances. Here's one, it's a tradition too, and a funny one at that. A member of the sanitary commission is on duty every day, he or she wears an armband with a red cross on it, and has far-reaching rights, the rights of a dictator, actually. He or she can ask any member of the collective, any Komsomol member, to leave the table and go and wash his hands, and there is no choice but to obey. He or she has the right to drop in at the flat of any member of the staff, be he an engineer or a teacher, and then report to the general meeting that there's dirt in so and so's flat. It was made a rule that no details were to be mentioned, they simply said: dirt. It was quite enough to start a drive for cleanliness. It became a tradition, I can't remember how it started to elect this "dictator" from among the girls, but it had to be a girl, someone from the lower forms, and she had to be a fiend for neatness. Say, they'd propose someone, but the rest would object: "It won't work, she's already 17." What was wrong with that? "The other day she went on duty with a hole in her stocking, so she's no good for the job."

Why does it have to be a girl and not a boy? A boy, they said, couldn't always be trusted to tidy up after himself, and then girls are meaner by nature. If a girl finds fault she won't care if the misdoer is her friend or enemy, she'll hang on regardless. I didn't think it fair to the boys and the older girls. They all agreed with me, but just the same when the elections came round and you proposed a girl of Komsomol age, they'd all vote against her, and call for one of Young Pioneer age. And the one they'd elect would be a mere child, you wouldn't dream of entrusting the job to her. "No," they'd say. "She's the right kind."

Those sanitary commission girls were real fiends, they were a proper menace, one of those twelve-year-olds would be after you all day—at dinner, at work, in the dormitory, everywhere. The rest would grumble: "What a life! When they can't find a speck of dust in the dormitory they'll turn a chair upside down and make a fuss if there's a bit of fluff or a single hair."

And she would put in her report that she found dirt in dormitory 15. And there was no arguing against it because it was true. This Nina, a mere child, would say: "You were combing your hair and dropping it all over the floor, so what am I expected to do—cover you up?" Grownup fellows would listen to this child accounting to them for her work, enumerating the rooms she had visited and making her comments on them, and they'd ask themselves: "Has she done well?" "Very well." Next time they'd elect her again, quite forgetting that they themselves had thought her a nuisance.

The collective felt that it was precisely to this sort of girls that the work should be entrusted—little girls, the most pedantic, the neatest and the most honest, girls too young to fall in love or get carried away with anything else. This tradition struck such deep roots, that even at Komsomol bureau meetings they'd say: "No, this girl won't do, let's get someone younger like Klava, she'll work hard."

Children are awfully good at creating such traditions.

Admittedly, when creating traditions a certain instinctive conservatism must be used, laudable conservatism I mean: respecting what has been done, respecting the values created by our comrades and refusing to let them be shattered by somebody's whim. (Mine, in this case.)

Among other traditions, I value one in particular and this is the tradition of militarisation—as a game.... This must not be a repetition of an army unit's rules. By no manner of means must it be a copying and imitating of something.

I am against perpetual marching, which certain young educators practise to excess. Their pupils are always marching, whether they're on their way to the dining-room, to work or anywhere else. It looks bad and is quite unnecessary. But in army life, especially in the life of the Red Army, there is much that is beautiful and thrilling, and in my work I became more and more convinced in the usefulness of this beauty. Children have the knack of further beautifying this "militarisation", making it more childlike and pleasant. My collective was militarised to a certain degree. To begin with, the terminology we used was somewhat military, for instance, "detachment commander". Terminology is important. I don't agree, for instance, that it's all right to call a school an *incomplete* secondary school.* I would give this matter thought. How does it sound: I go to an incomplete secondary school? A truncated title, surely. The name itself should be attractive to the pupil. I gave thought to the question of terminology. When I suggested calling our seniors team leaders, the youngsters said it was not the thing. A team leader is the leader of a team of workers in industry, and in our detachment we had to have a commander. But, after all, he'd be doing the same thing. That's as may be, the youngsters argued, but a *commander* can give orders whereas

* Incomplete secondary school (seven-year school)—the first seven forms of a complete or ten-year secondary school. They were also run as independent schools. Graduates could go on to the 8th form of a ten-year school without taking entrance exams, or enrol in special secondary schools (technical, medical, teachers' colleges, etc.) after passing exams.

if a *team leader* tries to do it he'll be told to mind his own business. In a children's collective they have a very nice and simple way of settling the problem of one-man management.

Take the term "report". Naturally, the boys could simply give me their account of the day, but I find that a certain formality appeals to them enormously. To make his report the commander must come dressed in his uniform and not in his overalls or the clothes he runs about in all day. He must hold his hand raised in salute while reporting, and I am not allowed to take it sitting down. All those present must also stand and salute. They are saluting the work of the detachment, of the whole collective.

Then, there's a great deal that can be borrowed from army life and introduced into the routine and movement of the collective. For example, the Commune had a splendid tradition for opening general meetings. The privilege belonged to the commander on duty exclusively. The amazing thing was that the tradition had gained so great a significance that even when big people arrived at the Commune, even if it was the People's Commissar himself, no one was allowed to open the meeting but the commander on duty. Bugles were played to call everyone to the meeting. After that, the orchestra seated on the balcony played three marches. People could sit and talk, come and go. When they were coming to the end of the third march I knew I had to be in the hall, I felt it was my duty: if I didn't come I would be accused of violating discipline. After the music had died away I had to give the order: "Attention! The flag!" I could not see the flag, but I was sure it was near and once the order was given it would be brought in. When the flag was borne into the room everyone stood up and the orchestra played a special flag salute. The meeting was considered open as soon as the flag-bearers had taken up their positions on the stage, whereupon the officer of the day would come in and say: "The meeting is open." And for ten years no meeting was opened in any other way.

This tradition adorns the collective, it creates the framework within which life can be made beautiful, and that being so it captivates the imagination. The red flag makes a splendid content for this tradition.

According to the same tradition, the flag-bearers and their attendants were elected by the general meeting from among the best and worthiest communards, "to the end of their days" they called it, meaning their days in the commune. The flag-bearers could not be punished, they had a room to themselves, an extra best suit, and they could not be addressed familiarly when they were guarding the flag.

Esteem for the flag is a tremendous educational means. At the Dzerzhinsky Commune it was displayed in the following manner: if the room where the flag was kept needed repainting and the flag had to be moved elsewhere, the only way to do it was to line up all the pupils, call in the brass band and solemnly carry the flag to the other room.

We travelled through almost the whole of the Ukraine, the Volga country, the Caucasus and the Crimea, and our red flag was never left unguarded for a minute. When my teacher friends heard about it, they said: "What are you doing? The boys have to sleep at night. You're making these trips for their health, and yet you have them standing guard all night long!"

We were speaking different tongues. I just could not see how a flag could be left unguarded on the march.

A sentry with a good rifle always stood at the entrance to the Commune. I am even afraid to mention it. He had no cartridges, of course, but he was vested with great power. Often the sentry was a boy of thirteen or fourteen. They took turns. They had to check the identity of any stranger coming in, find out his business, ask him whom he wanted to see, and they also had the right to bar his way with the rifle. The door was not locked at night, and the sentry had to stand guard. Sometimes he felt frightened, but anyway stand his two hours he did. Once a woman pedologist from

the Ukrainian People's Commissariat of Education came to the Commune with a Cheka man. A curious conversation took place between them: "D'you mean he just stands there?" she asked. "Yes, he does." "He must be bored. You ought to let him read a book." He said: "How can a sentry read a book?" "But surely good use must be made of the time! A person must broaden his knowledge." Two different people: she was surprised that the sentry was not doing anything, and he was surprised by the very suggestion that a sentry should read while on duty. They were surprised by different things.

There was another rule, a tradition rather. Holding on to the banisters when coming down the stairs was not allowed. I know how it started. It was a fine staircase in a fine building and the steps began to get worn out where people coming up and down clutched the banisters, and so the youngsters passed this rule in order to preserve the staircase. But later they forgot the reason. New pupils would ask: "Why mustn't we hold on to the banisters?" The answer was: "Because you've got to rely on your own spinal column and not the banisters." Originally, strengthening the spine had nothing to do with it: the idea was to preserve the staircase.

There has to be military smartness and trimness, but under no circumstances ordinary barracks-ground drilling. Shooting and riding are taught, and also military science. And that means efficiency and aesthetic education, which is absolutely essential in a collective of youngsters. This sort of training is especially valuable because it preserves the collective's strength, I mean it teaches the boys not to make vague, awkward gestures, slack and aimless movements. The matter of uniform is extremely important here. You know it better than I do, and on this score the People's Commissariat of Education and the Party have a definite point of view, so I shall not dwell on it. But a uniform is only good if it is handsome and comfortable. I had to go through a lot of different kinds of trouble and suffer plenty of setbacks before

I was finally able to introduce a more or less comfortable and handsome uniform.

But as far as uniforms go, I am prepared to carry the matter on further. In my opinion, the clothes of children should be so beautiful and so colourful that they would evoke amazement. In past ages the troops were dressed beautifully. It was the splendour of the privileged classes. With us it is the children who should be such a privileged class of society entitled to beautiful clothes. I would not stop at anything, I would give every school a very handsome uniform. It serves as a very good glue to stick a collective together. I was more or less headed in that direction, but I had my wings clipped. I had gold and silver monograms, embroidered skull caps, starched white pique collars, and so on. A collective which you dress well is 50 per cent easier to manage.

LECTURE TWO

Discipline, Regimen, Punishment and Reward

Today I will propose the theme of discipline, regimen, punishment and reward. Once again I want to remind you that my propositions are based entirely on my personal experience which I gained under rather extraordinary conditions, mostly in colonies and communes for juvenile delinquents. But I am convinced that the general system of my finds, and not just separate conclusions, can be applied to a normal children's collective. The logic here is this.

Out of my sixteen years of work as head of an institution for juvenile delinquents, the last ten, or perhaps even twelve, I look upon as normal work. It is my profound conviction that boys and girls become delinquents or "not normal" because they are treated as delinquents or "not normal" children. Normal education, active and purposeful, very quickly shapes them into a perfectly normal collective. There is no such thing as born criminals or inherently difficult children; personally, through experience, I have become a hundred per cent sure that it is so.

In my last years of work at the Dzerzhinsky Commune I emphatically objected to the very thought that mine was a collective of not normal children, of juvenile delinquents, and so the conclusions and methods which I intend to propose to you today are, in my personal opinion, applicable to normal children.

What is discipline? In our practice, some of the teachers and pedagogical thinkers are apt to regard discipline as a means of education. I hold that discipline is not a means of education but a result of education, and as a means of education it must differ from regimen. Regimen is a definite system of means and methods facilitating education. And the result of this education is discipline.

In making this assertion I suggest that discipline should be given a broader meaning than the conventionally accepted one in days before the Revolution—in pre-revolutionary schools and pre-revolutionary society. Then it was a form of domination, a form of suppression of personality, individual will and individual aspirations, and even, to a certain extent, a method of domination, a method of bringing the individual into submission with respect to the elements of power. And that is how discipline was regarded by all of us who lived and went to school under the old regime, and everyone knows that we, as well as the teachers, looked upon discipline in the same way: discipline was a code of certain compulsory regulations which were essential for convenience, order, and a well-being of sorts, a purely outward well-being, a sort of bond rather than a moral state.

In our society, discipline is both a moral and a political requirement. And yet I observe certain teachers who even now cannot renounce the old view on discipline. In the old society an undisciplined person was not regarded as an immoral person, as a person who was transgressing the social moral code. You will remember that in the old school both we and our comrades looked upon this defiance of discipline as something akin to heroism, a daring feat, or at any rate a sort of witty, amusing spectacle. All mischief-making was sure to be regarded not just by the pupils but even by the teachers themselves as an expression of liveliness or quick-wittedness, or perhaps as a manifestation of a revolutionary spirit.

In our society defiance of discipline means that the person is acting against society, and we must judge his behaviour

from the political and moral points of view. That is how every pedagogue should look upon discipline, provided, of course, that discipline is taken to mean a result of education.

First of all, as we already know, our discipline must always be a conscious discipline. It was precisely in the 1920s, when the theory of free education, or rather the tendency towards free education, was enjoying such wide popularity, that this formula on conscious discipline was being enlarged in the belief that discipline must stem from consciousness. Already in my early practice I saw that this formula could lead only to catastrophe. Persuading a person that he must obey and hoping that he will be persuaded into becoming disciplined means putting 50 or 60 per cent of success to the risk.

Discipline cannot be based on consciousness alone, since it is a result of the entire educational process and not of any special measures. It is a mistake to think that discipline can be instilled by means of some special methods aimed at creating it. Discipline is a product of the sum total of the educative efforts, including the teaching process, the process of political education, the process of character shaping, the process of collision—of facing and settling conflicts in the collective, the process of friendship and trust, and the whole educational process in its entirety, counting also such processes as physical education, physical development, and so on.

Expecting discipline to be built up by preachings alone means counting on extremely small returns.

It was when it came to preachings that the staunchest opposition was raised to discipline (by some of the pupils, I mean). And any attempt to convince them verbally of the need of discipline was liable to evoke as rousing a protest.

And so, trying to instil discipline by this means may only lead to endless argument. Nevertheless I emphatically insist that, as differing from pre-revolutionary discipline, ours—being a moral and political requirement—should be a conscious

striving, that is, it should be accompanied by a full awareness of what discipline is and what it is needed for.

How can this conscious sort of discipline be achieved?

In our school there is no theory of morals, there is no such subject, and there is no one appointed to teach this theory or obliged to communicate it to the children according to a given programme.

In the old school there was scripture. It was a subject refuted not by the pupils alone but very often by the priests themselves, who treated it as something deserving of little respect, but at the same time it did raise many moral problems which were touched upon during lessons in one way or another. Whether this theory yielded good results or not is another question, but in certain measure the problem of morals was set before the pupils in its theoretical rendering, i.e., they were told: do not steal, do not kill, do not insult, obey your elders, honour your parents, and so on. These moral concepts, the concepts of Christian morals which were meant to instil faith and religion, were revealed in their theoretical rendering, and moral laws—if only in their old-fashioned religious form—were expounded to the pupils.

My practice has brought me to the conclusion that we too must render the theory of morals. No such subject is taught in our modern schools. We have a collective of educators, we have Komsomol organisers and Young Pioneer leaders who, if they wished it, could very well present to the pupils a proper theory of morals and the theory of behaviour.

I am sure that we shall inevitably arrive at this form in the future development of our school. I was forced to present the theory of morals to my pupils in a straightforward manner, as a programme subject. I had not the right to introduce such a subject as morals myself, but I had before me a programme I had drawn up for my own personal guidance, which I set out before my pupils at the general meetings under various pretexts.

In the course of my experience I worked out a programme, drafting these talks of the moral theory type. I had time and opportunity to perfect my efforts in this direction somewhat, and I saw the results–they were very good and far-reaching, incomparably better, of course, than anything that could have been achieved in the old school with the subject handled by some priest, even if an enlightened one.

Let us take the question of stealing. We have the means to develop the theory of honesty–the theory of relation to one's own things, the things of others and things belonging to the state–with infinite conviction, very strict logic and great persuasiveness. In impact and force the old preachings about the evil of stealing stand no comparison to this concrete theory of behaviour towards property, the theory of prohibiting stealing, because the old logic that a person must not steal or God will punish him hardly convinced anyone and could not act as a brake on stealing.

Self-control, respect for women, children and old men, respect for oneself, and the whole theory of actions in relation to the society as a whole or to the collective could be presented to our pupils in a most convincing and compelling form.

This theory of behaviour, Soviet behaviour I mean, is supported by so many facts in the life of our society, in our social practice, in the history of our civil war, in the history of our Soviet struggle and especially in the history of the Communist Party, that it would take little effort to present the subject beautifully and convincingly.

I have reason to assert that a collective, before whom this theory of morals has been set out, will undoubtedly take it all in, and every one of the pupils will find for himself in every separate instance some compulsory moral forms and formulas.

I recall how quickly and gladly my collective took on new life after a single talk on this moral theme. And a series, or rather a cycle of such talks had a truly salubrious effect on the collective's philosophy of morals.

What general principles can serve as a basis here?

I have arrived at the following list of general moral principles. First of all, discipline as a form of our political and moral well-being must be exacted from the collective.

It is no use counting on discipline to appear of its own accord as a result of external measures, methods or talks given every now and again. Discipline, with a clearly defined purpose, has to be imposed on the collective in the form of a clear-cut, definite task.

These arguments, the need to exact discipline, are prompted by the following considerations. Firstly, every pupil should be convinced in his mind that discipline is a form enabling the whole collective to best attain its aim. The logic, provided it is presented clearly and fervently (I am against cool discourses on discipline), which asserts that without discipline a collective will not be able to attain its aim, will be the first brick laid in the foundation of a definite theory of action, that is, the theory of morals.

Secondly, the logic of our discipline asserts that discipline places each separate individual in a more secure and free position. This paradoxical assertion that discipline is freedom is very easily accepted by youngsters. The truth of it is confirmed for them at every step, and in their active campaigning for discipline they themselves say that it is freedom.

Discipline in a collective means perfect security for every individual, complete confidence in his right, his abilities and his future.

A great many facts in support of this principle can, of course, be found in the life of our society, in our Soviet history. Our revolution, our very society are a confirmation of this law.

Here is the second type of general moral requirements which should be set before a children's collective and which eventually will help the educator to settle any conflicts that may arise. In every separate case it is not only I but the

whole collective who accuses the offender of going against the interests of the other members and depriving them of their rightful freedom.

As a matter of fact, this co-operation on the part of the pupils can perhaps be put down to the fact that a good half of the waifs and juvenile delinquents I had then had already spent some time in one of those children's collectives where discipline is lacking, and had suffered all the terrible hardships of an undisciplined life. This involved gangster law, with ringleaders from among the older and tougher boys lording it over the weaker and younger, exploiting them and forcing them to steal and commit acts of hooliganism. These once victimised children looked upon discipline as a real godsend, recognising it to be an essential condition for the full development of their personality.

If I had the time I would tell you about some very striking instances of boys being reborn almost instantaneously upon finding themselves in a disciplined environment. I shall only tell you about one such case.

One night in 1932, on orders from the NKVD I collected fifty homeless waifs off the express trains which made a stop at Kharkov. The urchins were in a very bad state. The first thing that struck me was that they all knew one another, although I took them off different trains, coming from the Caucasus and the Crimea in the main, but know each other they did. This was a "seaside resort gang" which travelled back and forth, met, crossed each other's paths and had some sort of relations among themselves.

When I brought them in, I had them washed, their hair shaved off, and so on. And the very next day they had a fight. It turned out that they had a great number of scores to settle. Someone had stolen something from someone else, someone had insulted someone, someone had broken his word, and it became clear to me at once that this group of fifty had its own ringleaders, its exploiters, its rulers and its exploited and oppressed. It was not only I who saw it but also my communards, and we realised that it was a mis-

take to keep those fifty together in the hopes of shaping them into a separate small collective.

The very next evening we broke up the group, taking care to put the tougher boys in the strongest detachments.

For a week we watched them trying to settle their old scores whenever they met. Under pressure of the collective an end was put to it, but several boys ran away from the Commune because they were unable to reconcile themselves to the fact that they had been forced to yield to an enemy stronger than themselves.

We gave this question a good airing at the Komsomol meeting, and brought to light many circumstances of that undisciplined life in which the individual suffered from a lack of discipline, and then, availing ourselves of the opportunity, we launched a campaign to elucidate this moral principle, to make it clear to the boys that discipline means freedom to the individual, and the ones to speak most passionately, convincingly and emotionally in support of this principle were the new boys, the street arabs I had picked up at the Kharkov Railway Station. They told the meeting how hard life was when there was no discipline, and how in that fortnight of living a new way of life they had come to understand from their own experience what discipline was.

Understanding came to them because we had launched the campaign and invited the discussion. If we had not talked to them about it they might have felt that life without discipline was hard, but they would not have apprehended it.

It was from children such as these, who had suffered from the anarchy reigning in a society of waifs and strays, that I reared the staunchest champions of discipline, its most ardent defenders and most dedicated preachers. And if I were to recall all the boys who were my right hand in the teachers' collective, you would see that they were the very people who, as children, had suffered most from the anarchy of an undisciplined society.

The third point of my moral theory, which should be set before the collective, which should always be remembered by the collective and should always guide it in its fight for discipline, is this: the interests of the collective are superior to the interests of the individual. This, it would seem, is a perfectly understandable theorem to us, Soviet citizens. And yet, in practice it is far from understandable to very many intelligent, educated, cultured and even socially cultured people.

We assert that the interests of the collective come before the interests of the individual in cases where he is opposed to the collective.

But when it comes to a case in hand, matters are often decided the other way about.

In the course of my life I once came up against a complicated case like that. In the last years at the Dzerzhinsky Commune there were no educators, all we had were school teachers, but no special tutors, and so the work was done by our senior pupils, Komsomol members in the main. The pattern on which our collective was built made this possible. The pupils were divided into detachments each of which had its own commander. A commander was answerable for everything the collective did in the course of the day: cleaning the premises, tidying their things, serving and eating meals, receiving visitors, attending school and working at the factory. He was called the officer of the day, wore an armband, and was vested with great authority which he had to have in order to direct the day's activities all by himself. His orders had to be obeyed without question, and it was only at the end of the day, his duty done, that he had to give an account of all the orders he had issued. No one had the right to talk to him sitting down, you had to stand before him, and no one had the right to argue with him in any way. As a rule the commander on duty was a merited, respected comrade, and no one ever defied him.

One day, the commander on duty was a boy whom we shall call Ivanov for reference. He was a member of the

Komsomol, one of our promising cultural workers, a member of the dramatic club, a good industrial worker. He enjoyed everyone's respect, mine as well. I had personally picked him up in Simferopol—the boy was one of the "old" strays, with a big record of lawbreaking and vagrancy behind him.

When making his report to me in the evening, he said that someone had stolen Mezyak's radio which that boy had just bought. It was the first radio in the Commune. Mezyak had paid seventy rubles for it. It had taken him six months to save up for it out of his pay. The radio always stood beside his bed, and was there no more. The dormitory was always open, since locks were not allowed in the Commune, but going into the room during the day was forbidden, and anyway none of the communards could have gone in because they were away at work.

I suggested calling a general meeting at which the floor was given to Ivanov. He spoke with great tact, suggested that someone might have gone into the room to get their tools, and so on; he told the meeting what he suspected, proposed electing a commission, and urged the general meeting to investigate the case thoroughly and find the culprit, because he was sorry for Mezyak and also worried by the act itself —the theft of something for which a person had been saving money from his pay for six months.

But nothing was found out that evening; the boys went to bed none the wiser. Mezyak, by the way, was about twelve.

Early next morning a group of lower-form pupils, Young Pioneers all of them, came to me and told me that they had searched the place, having got up at five o'clock, and had found the radio in the theatre under the stage. They asked me to let them have the day off to watch.

They stayed there the whole day, and then they came and told me that it was Ivanov himself who had stolen the radio: they saw him come close to the prompt-box several times and stand there for a few minutes, listening. They had no other proof. The only evidence against him was that

he had come in, when not on duty, stood by the prompt-box and listened.

I decided to take the bull by the horns: I called in Ivanov and told him:"It was you who stole the radio."

He turned pale, sat down, and said: "Yes."

This case became the object of discussion at our general meeting. The Komsomol organisation expelled Ivanov and placed the matter in the hands of the communards. A boy nicknamed Robespierre was in the chair. He always proposed one thing–expulsion. This time, too, the meeting moved to expel Ivanov, to literally kick him out–to open the front door and throw him down the stairs.

I objected to this measure, recalling other cases when this one and that one of those present had almost been expelled, but I didn't get anywhere.

Then I rang up the NKVD and told them that the general meeting had adopted a decision to expel a boy, to kick him out in such and such a way. The NKVD replied that they would not endorse this decision and that it was up to me to get the meeting to repeal it.

I carried great authority with the communards and could get them to do anything I wanted, very difficult things sometimes. But here I was helpless–they refused to give me the floor for the first time in the Commune's existence.

And that was that. Still, I told them that they had no right to expel Ivanov before they received the NKVD's approval. They agreed that I was right, and postponed the matter till the next day's meeting when in the presence of the NKVD representatives they would reiterate their decision.

There was trouble for me, I was rebuked for failing to get the sentence repealed. The next day, several prominent Cheka men arrived at the Commune.

"What are you here for? To defend Ivanov?" the boys demanded.

"No, to see justice done."

And then a debate on discipline ensued between the Cheka

men and the communards, a debate which even now can serve me as a framework for the elaboration of this vitally important problem.

This was what the Cheka men said at the general meeting:

"What are you trying to prove by your decision? Ivanov is your front-ranker, an active member of your collective, you showed confidence in him, you entrusted the Commune to him, and obeyed his orders without question. And now, because he stole once, you are kicking him out. Where is he supposed to go? It's the streets for him, and that means —delinquency! Surely you are not so weak that you can't make a man of Ivanov?"

Ivanov himself, it must be said, was in a fit of hysterics all that day, he quite went to pieces.

"See the state he's in," the Cheka men said, indicating Ivanov. "Yours is such a strong collective, you have remoulded so many characters, surely you are not afraid that he'll be a bad influence! After all, there are 456 of you. And only one of him."

It was a killing argument, killing logic.

And this was what the communards replied, Robespierre and others, people with much less experience than the Cheka men, but people who felt responsible for their collective.

"If Ivanov goes wrong it's fair enough. Let him. It would have been one thing if he'd simply gone and pinched something. But he was the commander on duty, we trusted the Commune to him, he presided at the general meeting and begged us to tell all we knew. It's not mere stealing. He went against all of us, brazenly and cynically, falling for the seventy-ruble prize; he went against us and against Mezyak who had been saving up for months, putting ten rubles aside out of his monthly pay. And so if Ivanov goes wrong we shan't waste pity on him.

"Sure we can manage him. We're not afraid. We're simply not interested. We'd manage him because we know we can kick him out. But if we keep *him* and don't kick out the next one like him either, our collective will lose its power

and then we won't be able to manage anyone any more. We have seventy others like Ivanov, and kicking him out will help us to manage them."

The Cheka men argued that losing a member would put a stigma on the collective, that Ivanov would go wrong. The communards came back: look at such and such a colony, there's no discipline there and see how many members they lose a year. Fifty per cent of the boys run away every year. And so if we enforce discipline so strictly we stand to lose less, we're willing to lose Ivanov, but then we'll be able to reform the others.

The debate went on all evening. The communards stopped objecting at long last and even applauded the good speeches of the Cheka men. But when it came to voting and the chairman said: "Who's for Ivanov's expulsion?"—all hands went up at once. Once again the Cheka men took the floor, once again they tried persuasion, but I could see from their faces that they knew Ivanov's fate was decided whatever they said. By midnight the resolution was adopted: to expel Ivanov and do it the way the communards wanted to do it the day before: open the front door and throw him down the steps. We were able to prevent the use of violence, however, and got Ivanov sent under escort to Kharkov.

And so they did give him the rogue's march. Afterwards, of course, we saw to it that Ivanov was sent to another colony, taking care to keep it a secret from our communards. They found out about it a year later, though, and asked me how I could have gone against the decision of the general meeting: they had expelled him and yet I went and intervened in his behalf.

This case started me thinking: how far above the interests of the individual should the interests of the collective be placed? And now I'm inclined to think that the interests of the collective should prevail to the very end, even if it is relentless—and then and only then will education really serve both the collective and the individual.

I have more to say on this subject. All I will say at this

point, however, is that it need not be physically relentless, that is, the technique of relentlessness has to be organised in such a way that while the collective's interests should triumph over the individual's, the individual in question should not be placed in a grave, desperate position.

And last but not least, here is the fourth theorem which should be taught to the children as pure theory: discipline is an adornment for the collective. This aspect of discipline –its beauty and dignity–is most important. From what I know, very little is done about it in our children's collectives. Our discipline is sometimes "a bore"–to use my strays' pet expression, it's dull, and actually boils down to nagging, pushing about, and exasperating twaddle. The question of making discipline pleasant, exciting and evocative is simply a question of pedagogical technique.

In my own experience I did not arrive at the final form of a beautiful discipline too soon. The danger to be avoided here, of course, is letting discipline become a mere outward adornment. The beauty must spring from its essence.

For my own part, at any rate, I had finally drawn up for myself a rather involved scheme to cultivate the aesthetic side of discipline. To give you an example I'll tell you about some of my methods which I used not so much to enforce discipline as to test and maintain its attractiveness.

For instance, breakfast was late. The signal for breakfast was given ten minutes late. I do not know who was to blame: the kitchen staff, the commander on duty, or one of the pupils who had overslept. The question was what to do next: put off the signal for work for ten minutes, start work later, or forego breakfast. In practice this can be a very difficult question to decide.

I had a big hired staff of engineers, foremen and instructors, about two hundred people in all, and time was precious to them too. They came to work at eight o'clock, and the factory whistle had to go at eight sharp. And there was breakfast ten minutes late, the communards were not ready to start for work, and it meant that I would have to

keep the workers and engineers after hours. Many of them lived out of town, they had a train to catch, and so forth. And anyway the rules of punctuality were involved.

In my last years at the Commune I never doubted once what I had to do; nor did the pupils. Breakfast was late. I would give the order for the whistle to go at eight sharp. Some of the boys would come running out, others would only be sitting down to breakfast. I would go into the dining-room and announce that breakfast was finished. I realised perfectly well that I was making them go hungry, I knew perfectly well that it was bad for them physically, and so on. But nevertheless I never doubted my action once. If I had done this to a collective that had no feeling of the beauty of discipline, someone would have surely said: "Are we expected to go hungry, or what?"

But no one ever said such things to me. Everyone understood perfectly that this was what I had to do, and the fact that I was able to walk into the dining-room and give the order showed that I had confidence in the collective, demanding of them that they should go without breakfast.

At one time the officers of the day began to complain to me about boys wasting time in the dormitory, in no hurry to come down to the dining-room, and as a result being late for breakfast. I never started any theoretical discussions on this subject, and never said anything to anyone. I simply went and stood outside the dining-room door in the morning and got into conversation with someone there about other things. And, do you know, the late-comers, a hundred or a hundred-and-fifty of them, mostly seniors, instead of going in to breakfast would dash past me and go straight to the factory. "Good-morning, Anton Semyonovich," they would say. None of them complained about missing breakfast, and only occasionally one of them would say to me in the evening: "You certainly starved us today."

On this basis I was able to try different exercises. Say, everyone would be waiting for the film *Battleship Potyomkin* to begin. Everyone would be seated in the hall, and the film

would be on. During the third part I would say: "The fourth, second and third detachments, come outside."

"What's happened?"

"I've been told that some suspicious-looking characters are prowling outside. Go and make sure."

"Yes, sir."

They could not be sure that any suspicious-looking characters were really prowling outside, they might even suspect it was simply a test, but if anyone had put it into so many words he would have landed in trouble with the others. They would go outside, make sure there was no one there, and come back. They would miss part of their favourite film, yet no one would say a word of complaint, they would sit down quietly and watch the rest of it.

It was a kind of exercise. There were many different kinds. For instance, we had a tradition to give the best detachment the hardest and most unpleasant tasks when dividing up the house-cleaning work. And I have to tell you that cleaning was quite a strenuous job, because we had several delegations coming to the Commune a day, and we had to keep the place spick and span, in perfect shining order.

"Which is the best detachment?"

"The sixth."

And so the sixth detachment, being the best, was given the most unpleasant work to do. It had to do the nastiest job for being the best. We found the logic quite natural. It was the best detachment and as such it was entrusted with the hardest job.

Or very often, when we were on one of our trips we would find ourselves in difficulties, surmounting which called for no little physical effort, speed and energy. Which detachment should we send? The best one, and this best detachment was proud to do it. I can hardly imagine myself having any qualms about giving it an extra job, or an assignment over and above its ordinary duties. I would give it the extra job without a moment's hesitation, precisely because it was the best and because my confidence in it would be

appreciated. The peculiar beauty of this would not be lost on the boys.

This sensitivity to beauty will be the last finishing touch to discipline, making it a thing of really fine workmanship. Not every collective will attain it, but if a collective does attain it and follows the logic that the higher you stand the more is demanded of you, if it adopts this logic as genuine, living logic, it will mean that in discipline and education the collective has reached a certain satisfactory level.

And now for the last theoretical general premise, which I thought necessary to set before my pupils as often as possible in a very simple form, easy for them to grasp: if a person has to do something he finds pleasure in doing, he will always do it, discipline or no discipline; discipline comes in when he does something he finds unpleasant to do with equal pleasure. This is a very important disciplinary thesis. It must also be made note of and stressed as often as possible at every opportunity.

Well, such is briefly the general theory of behaviour, the theory of morals, which should be set out before the children as a definite sum of knowledge, stress on which must always be laid in talks and the children's understanding of which must always be striven for. Only in this manner, by forming a general theory of it, will discipline become a conscious thing.

In all these theorems and axioms, emphasis must always be made on the main and most important thing—the political significance of discipline. In this respect our Soviet reality provides plenty of brilliant examples. The greatest achievements and the most glorious chapters of our history are associated with a splendid display of discipline. Remember our Arctic explorations, Papanin's group,* all the feats of the Heroes of the Soviet Union,** take the history of collectivisa-

* I. D. Papanin, a well-known Polar explorer, headed a four-man Soviet Arctic expedition, which on May 21, 1937, was landed on ice in the region of the North Pole, and drifting for nine months studied the natural conditions of the central part of the Arctic Ocean.

** The title was introduced in 1934 in connection with the rescue of a group of shipwrecked Arctic explorers by Soviet pilots.

tion, take the history of our industrialisation—and in our literature as well you will find magnificent examples which you can present to your pupils as models of Soviet discipline, based on these very principles of discipline.

Still, as I have said already, this consciousness, this theory of behaviour should be an accompaniment to discipline, it should run parallel to discipline, and not be the basis of discipline.

What then is the basis of discipline?

To put it in plain words, without delving into the depths of psychological research, the basis of discipline is exactingness without theory. If anyone were to ask me to define the essence of my pedagogical experience in the briefest of formulas, I would say: place the utmost demands upon a person and treat him with the utmost respect. I am convinced that this is the formula of Soviet discipline, the formula of our society generally. Our society differs from bourgeois society in that we place much higher demands upon a person than does bourgeois society, and our demands are more far-reaching besides. In bourgeois society a person may open a shop, he may exploit others, he may go in for speculation, or be a rentier. There, much fewer demands are placed upon a person than in our society.

But, on the other hand, we treat him with incomparably greater and basically different respect. This combination of the most exacting demands with the utmost respect for a person are part and parcel of the same thing—they are not two different things. By placing demands upon a person we show our respect for his strength and abilities, and by showing respect for him we make demands on him at the same time. It is not a respect for something extraneous, something outside society, a pleasant and beautiful something. It is the respect due to a comrade who is taking part in our common endeavour, who is doing our common job with us, it is respect due to a worker.

No collective and no discipline can be formed, of course, unless demands are placed upon the individual. I am all for

demands—consistent, extreme, clear-cut, without amendments or concessions.

Those of you who have read my book *The Road to Life* will know that I began with such demands and will also know the story of my beating up Zadorov. It proved above all else my lack of training as an educator, my poor knowledge of pedagogical techniques, the poor state of my nerves, and my despair. But it was not punishment. That, too, was a demand.

In the first years of my work I carried my demands to the limit, to violence, but I never punished my pupils for their misdeeds, I never punished them so cruelly and with such extreme measures. That crime of mine, which I have described, was not a punishment, it was a demand.

I would not recommend you to repeat my experience because this is 1938 and not 1920, and also because I hardly think any of you or the comrades you teach will ever find yourselves in a situation as difficult, lonely and involved as mine had been. But I insist that there can be no upbringing if no demands are made. A demand cannot be a halfway thing. It must be utmost in the Bolshevik way, as high as it can possibly be.

This matter of issuing demands is a very difficult thing, naturally, but it does not call for a strong will at all, as many believe. Personally, I am not a strong-willed man, and I never possessed the qualities of a strong personality. Far from it. I am an ordinary intellectual, an ordinary teacher. I was simply convinced that I had no right to play about with or flaunt my intellectuality, and I knew that educators often did just that simply because they did not know what line to take. I am convinced that the correct line is to place demands upon the pupils.

Needless to say this line must be developed further. But I firmly believe that the ways of development are always the same. If you are going to take on a collective of undisciplined or only outwardly disciplined children, you will

have to begin by placing your own individual demands upon them.

Very often, in the majority of cases actually, it is sufficient to state a resolute demand that will not break or bend, to get the children to give in to you and do what you want them to do. Both suggestion and knowledge that you are right play a certain part in this. Thereafter, everything will depend on your intellect. Rude, illogical and ridiculous demands which are not linked with the demands of the collective must never be made.

I'm afraid I won't be logical now. Here is the theorem I devised for myself personally: whenever I was not sure what I could demand, whether it would be right or wrong, I pretended not to see anything. I bided my time until it became clear to me—and to anyone else with any common sense—that I was right. And then I stated my dictatorial demands fully, and since they sounded better because I was so obviously right, I acted with greater boldness, and the pupils, knowing that I was right, gave in to me easily.

To my mind, this logic in the early stages should be made law. An educator who gives free rein to his sense of power and turns into a petty tyrant in the eyes of his pupils, demanding things they cannot understand, will never win a victory over them.

I did not demand from my first lot of strays that they should not steal. I realised that I could not hope to reform them right away. But I did demand of them that they should get up at a given hour and perform the jobs they had to perform. They went on stealing, however, and for the time being I closed my eyes to it.

At any rate, one cannot begin to educate a collective without being sincere, frank, convinced, passionate and determined in the demands one makes. And anyone who intends to begin with vacillating, favour-currying, and pleading is making a very grave mistake.

The theory of morals should develop alongside the development of demands, but under no circumstances must the

first be substituted for the second. When occasion allows you to theorise and explain to the youngsters what they must do, do so by all means. But when the occasion calls for firmness you must not indulge in any theorising, you must simply state your demands and insist on their fulfilment.

I have been to many schools, Kiev schools mostly. What really amazed me about those children was their awful shouting, the fidgeting, their lack of seriousness, their hysterical excitement, their running up and down the stairs, breaking windows, smashing noses, bruising faces, and so on.

I can't stand shouting. My nerves must have been strong enough if I was able to write my *Road to Life* while living among a crowd of youngsters. Their talking did not bother me. But shouting, screaming and dashing about are, to my mind, something children can do very well without.

And yet I have heard some pedagogues contend that a child must run about, a child must shout, it's supposed to be natural.

I object to this theory. A child needs none of it. It was everybody shouting in school that, more than anything else, frayed everyone's nerves all the time, and did nothing but harm. On the contrary, my experience has convinced me that a children's collective can easily be trained to behave in an orderly manner, to decelerate, to show consideration for others and respect property, doors, windows, and so forth. You would never hear this sort of racket going on at the Commune. I finally got the pupils to behave in a perfectly orderly manner when out in the street, on the school grounds and indoors. I demanded perfect orderliness in movement.

If I were put in charge of a school now I would begin by calling everyone together and telling them that I never wanted to see such behaviour again. No arguments, no theories. Later I would present them with a theory, but not at the very start. I would make a determined start: never let me see that again! I never want to see a yelling pupil in school again.

This emphatic demand, spoken in a tone that will brook no argument, must be made as soon as a collective is taken on. I cannot imagine how discipline could be instilled in a disorderly high-strung and uncontrolled collective unless the organiser stated his demands in this cold tone. After that, he would find things much easier.

The second stage comes when first one, then two, then three and then four pupils begin to side with you, forming a group that consciously wants to maintain discipline.

I hurried matters up. It did not worry me that my boys and girls had quite a lot of faults, I wanted to assemble a group as soon as I could so they would support my demands by making their own, voicing them at general meetings, and stating their views to the other pupils. It was imperative at the second stage of development to have a nucleus like that formed around me.

And now for the third stage when the collective begins to make the demands. It is the result and also our compensation for the nervous strain of the first stage. When the collective begins to make the demands, when stability comes to the tone and style of its activities, the educator's work becomes a thing of mathematical precision and efficiency.

I never demanded anything any more during my last five years at the Dzerzhinsky Commune. On the contrary, I acted as a sort of brake on the collective's demands, because a collective is apt to take too big a start and demand too much from an individual.

Once this stage has been reached you will be able to introduce the theory of morals on a broad scale. It will now be understandable to all that the moral and political requirements are the basic ones, and as a result each pupil will adopt an exacting attitude towards himself, taking the strongest view of his own behaviour.

I regard this line of development—from the dictatorial exactingness of the organiser to a free-will exactingness of every individual towards himself against the background of the collective's demands—the basic line in the development

of a Soviet children's collective. I think there can be no fixed forms. One collective may be going through the first stage of development, and that being so it will need to have a dictator-like educator to guide it, but it must go on to the next stage—to the form of free collective demand—as soon as possible, and then on to demands made upon himself by the free individual.

Demand is not all there is, of course. It is an essential element of discipline, but not the sole one. True, in essence all the other elements also belong to the category of demands, but they are stated in a less resolute form. Attraction and compulsion are, as it were, a weaker form of demand. And last but not least comes threat—a stronger form than ordinary demand.

I maintain that all these forms must be applied in our practice.

What is attraction? It is a form subject to development as well. It is one thing if the attraction is a gift, a reward, a bonus or some other benefit to be enjoyed by individuals singly, and quite another if it is an aesthetic attraction, if the appeal lies in the inner beauty of an action.

It is the same with compulsion. At the early stage it may be expressed in a more elementary form, in the form of argument or persuasion. At a higher stage compulsion is expressed by hint, smile or joke. It is something the children value and appreciate.

Whereas at the early stages of a collective's development you may threaten the children with punishment and other trouble, later on it will no longer be necessary. In a developed collective threats are inadmissible, and at the Dzerzhinsky Commune I never permitted myself to threaten anyone, saying I'll do this and that to you! It would have been a mistake on my part. What I did threaten my charges with was putting the matter before the general meeting, and there was nothing they feared more.

In the development of a collective, compulsion, attraction and threat may be greatly varied in form. At the Dzerzhinsky

Commune in later years rewards for good work or behaviour, granted to pupils singly, were ranged in this ascending manner: gift, bonus, and gratitude endorsed by order and read out before the ranks. This last, highest award, which was not accompanied by any gifts or material pleasures, was fought for by the best detachments. What was it they fought for? For the honour. All the pupils were ordered to put on their best clothes and assemble on the parade ground. Next the brass band marched in, and then all the teachers, engineers and instructors, forming a separate line. The order was given: "Attention!" The flag was borne in, the band played a flourish, and then the boy who was to be rewarded and I came out. The order: "By decision of the general meeting, gratitude is expressed to so and so", was then read out.

The gratitude was entered into the detachment's and the Commune's journals, and a notice was posted on the honours board–that so and so, or detachment number so and so, had been thanked before the ranks on such and such a date.

Making this the highest award is only feasible in a collective which has noble sentiments, high moral qualities and self-respect. It is something to be striven for, but not begun with. One should begin with attraction of a more primitive kind, with material and other pleasures suited for each separate case, for instance, like going to the theatre to see a play. A good educator will, of course, find a great many nuances for the application of the different forms–attraction, compulsion, threat and demand–in each single case.

The question is–demand what? The formula I would suggest here should, rather than develop, always remain the same. First of all, the only thing that must be demanded is submission to the collective. It is the communards who taught me that. In developing their collective they arrived at a very interesting form.

In later years we did not punish pupils for stealing. It came as something of a surprise for me that the communards had evolved their own method of dealing with petty thieves.

One of the communards, a boy of sixteen, stole five rubles from his friend's locker. He was called to the general meeting, and told to stand in the centre of the room which was like this one only bigger, and had an endless sofa running along the wall. Everyone sat on this sofa, there was no table or anything in the middle, and whoever was called upon to give account to the general meeting had to come out and stand in the very centre, right under the chandelier. The communards had certain set rules. For instance, if a boy was called as a witness, he didn't have to come out. Nor did a commander if he was accounting for his detachment; but if it was for himself personally he did have to. I do not remember any cases dealt with in any other way. Refusal to come out into the middle of the room was regarded as refusal to obey the collective. A boy might commit a small crime and get away with a small punishment, but if he refused to come out into the middle he was tried for the supreme offence of going against the collective.

Well, the boy came out.

"Was it you who stole the money?" he was asked.

"Yes, it was."

"Who wants to take the floor?"

The boy had to stand at attention.

The first person to take the floor was Robespierre, the one who always demanded expulsion.

"What are we to do with him?" he said. "He's a savage. He can't help stealing. Listen you, you'll steal two more times."

Everyone liked this speech.

"Quite right, he'll steal two more times. Let him leave the middle of the room," everyone said.

"What d'you mean I'll steal two more times?" the culprit said, hurt. "On my word of honour, I won't!"

"We know best," said Robespierre. "You'll steal two more times."

The culprit walked out. That evening he came to my room.

"It's a hell of a business!" he said. "They didn't even punish me. They're ragging me, saying I'll steal two more times."

"Well, prove to them that they were wrong to rag."

Can you imagine, a week passed and he stole a cutter from his neighbour's locker. And there he stood in the middle of the room again, and when the chairman asked him: "Did you steal that cutter?" everyone laughed.

Robespierre took the floor.

"I told you you'd steal two more times, and you did steal," he said. "So what was the sense of telling people we'd wronged you? And you will steal one more time."

The boy left. He stayed good for a month, and then he went into the kitchen and stole a pie.

When he stood in the middle of the room again, everyone looked at him with sympathy. And Robespierre asked him: "Well, is it the last time?"

"I know now it's the last time."

They let him go, and he never stole again. They proved right.

Everyone liked it so much that it became a custom to say: "You'll steal two more times" whenever we had a case of theft. The sentence became symbolic.

"What's the big idea?" I asked the boys. "Telling people they'll steal two more times! There are 450 of you here, and if every one of you steals three times what will happen to the Commune?"

"Don't worry," they said to me.

And, indeed, I needn't have worried, because it had such a killing effect, this force of the collective's conviction, that all stealing stopped, and when one boy did steal something he begged on his bended knees not to be placed in the middle of the room because, if he was, that symbolic sentence which he used to say to others would be said to him, and he solemnly promised never to steal again.

We did not punish for such crimes as petty thieving. It

was considered a disease, the force of old habit which the culprit hadn't got over yet.

Nor did we punish newcomers for rudeness or a certain leaning towards hooliganism. What we did punish them for was something else.

Take a case like this, for instance. Shura, one of the best girls we had, a veteran communard, commander of a detachment, member of the Komsomol, a pretty, lively girl, whom everyone treated with respect, went off on leave one day and did not come back that night. A girl friend of hers telephoned through to us to say that Shura had fallen ill and was staying the night at her place.

The commander on duty, who answered the telephone, came and reported it to me.

The news alarmed me. I told Vershnev, the Commune's physician and our former pupil, to go there and see what was wrong with her. He went, but found no one in—neither Shura nor her hostess. The next day, Shura was ordered to stand in the middle of the room.

There was girlish embarrassment in her manner and something else too.

"I wanted to go to the theatre, but I was afraid I wouldn't be allowed," she said.

Saying this she smiled in such a shy, sweet way.

Yet it was anything but a smiling matter. I knew it, and all the communards knew it. Robespierre, as usual, proposed to expel her, because if every detachment commander took it into his head to go to town and "fall ill" there, making us send doctors out, and so on and so forth.

I looked at them, wondering....

"Let's vote on this," the chairman said.

"You've gone mad!" I told them. "She's been here for so many years, and you'd go and expel her!"

"I suppose we are going too far," Robespierre said. "But anyway she's got to be put under arrest for ten hours."

That was the verdict—ten hours' arrest, and after that the Komsomol took over. They made it "pretty hot" for her at

the Komsomol meeting that evening. The Party organisation had to intervene so Shura would not be expelled from the Komsomol. What the members said to her was this: it's worse than stealing. You, a member of the Komsomol, a detachment commander, rang up to say you were ill, but you weren't ill, you simply wanted to go somewhere, and so you lied, and that is a crime.

This logic does not come at once, it comes gradually and gains ground as the collective develops.

One has to be most exacting towards a person who goes against the collective more or less intentionally. One may be less strict when the offense can be blamed on the offender's nature, his character, his lack of self-control, or his political and moral ignorance. In such a case one may count on good influence and the gradual accumulation of good habits to have the desired effect. But in cases where a person consciously goes against the collective, refusing to recognise its power and flouting its demands, one has to be firm to the end, until this person has acknowledged the fact that the collective must be obeyed.

And now a few words about punishment. Things are not too well with us in this respect. On the one hand we have already admitted that punishment can be both necessary and useful. But on the other, although punishment is permissible, there is a line, born of our peculiar squeamishness and followed mainly by us teachers, of course, which implies that punishment is permissible but best avoided. You are free to punish, but if you do punish, you're a poor pedagogue. A pedagogue is considered good if he does not punish.

I am sure that this logic must confuse the pedagogue. And so it has to be established once and for all just what is punishment. Personally I am convinced that punishment is not so very beneficial. But I also maintain that where punishment has to be meted out the teacher has no right to suspend it. To punish is more than a right, it is a duty in cases where it is imperative to punish. In other words, I assert that a teacher may either punish or not punish, but

if his conscience and his convictions dictate that he must punish, he has no right to refuse to do it. Punishment should be proclaimed an educational measure as natural, straightforward and logically acceptable as any other.

The Christian attitude towards punishment as a necessary evil must be resolutely rejected. To my mind, the notion that punishment is an evil which for some reason is necessary does not quite agree with either logical or theoretical views. There can be no talk about evil in cases where punishment will do good, where no other measures can be adopted, and the teacher feels that it is his duty to punish. This belief that punishment is a necessary evil turns the teacher into a practising hypocrite. There must be no hypocrisy. No teacher must flirt with the notion that he is a saint since he gets along without resorting to punishment.

What is a person who knows that he ought to punish supposed to do? He broods and worries: so and so manages without punishing, and what will people say about me? They'll say I'm a second-rate pedagogue.

This sort of hypocrisy has to be done away with, I say. A teacher must apply punishment where it ought to be applied and where it can do good.

This does not at all mean, however, that we are asserting the advisability of punishment in all and every case.

What is punishment? I believe that it is in the sphere of punishment particularly that Soviet pedagogy has the opportunity of discovering much that is new. In our society we have so much respect for man, so much humaneness, that we should be able to arrive at the happiest possible norm in the matter of punishment. This is what this happy norm should be: a punishment must settle and eliminate a conflict and not create new conflicts.

The evil of the old-world punishment lay in the fact that while eliminating one conflict it created another one, the settlement of which was necessarily more involved still.

In what way does Soviet punishment differ from other punishments? In the first place, its aim must never be the

infliction of suffering. According to usual logic: I shall punish you, you will suffer, and others watching you suffer will say to themselves: we can see you suffering, and we must take care not to do the same.

There must be no physical or moral suffering. What then is the meaning of punishment? Knowing that the collective condemns your action. The culprit must not feel crushed by the punishment, but it will make him think over his mistake, and ponder on his estrangement, however slight, from the collective.

And that is why punishment should be resorted to only when logic demands it and only when public opinion is for it. Punishing is wrong if the collective is not on your side, if you have not succeeded in winning it over to your side. If your decision is opposed by everyone, your punishment will do more harm than good. You are free to punish only if you feel that you have the backing of the collective.

So much for the meaning of punishment.

And now, for the form.

I am against any sort of established forms. Punishment must be entirely individual, best suited to the person in question, but nevertheless there can be certain laws and forms restricting the right to punish.

In my practical work I upheld the view that the right to punish belonged to either the whole collective, that is the general meeting, or to one person, authorised by the collective. I cannot imagine how a collective could be healthy if ten different people had the right to punish.

At the Dzerzhinsky Commune, where I had charge of the pupils in their factory work, school and everyday life, the right belonged to me alone. It is an essential requirement. It is also essential to have a single logic of punishment and not to punish often.

Secondly, punishment must have its traditions and its rules for those who mete it out.

At the Dzerzhinsky Commune we had a rule. Every newcomer was called a *pupil*. After a time, when his "belonging"

to the collective became obvious to all he was given the title of *communard* and a badge with the letters FED (Felix Edmundovich Dzerzhinsky) on it. This badge confirmed his status of a communard.

I could punish a pupil by giving him a fatigue. This was work for half an hour in the kitchen or the hothouse but not at the factory. Or I could deprive him of leave on a Sunday, or suspend his pocket money: the money earned by the pupils was credited to their personal savings account, and without my endorsement they could not draw any for pocket money. The most terrible punishment I could use was dismissing the culprit from the factory and putting him on house jobs.

Those were the punishments I was able to apply and had the right to apply to *pupils.*

I had no right to apply them to the *communards.* The only punishment we had then was arrest. A pupil, on the other hand, could not be put under guard.

This system had an enormous significance. Every pupil tried to be promoted to communard as quickly as possible to be able to enjoy this privilege. I had no inhibitions about putting them under arrest. They would get an hour for the smallest offence, for trifles, even for having a button undone. When giving this order I had no right to remain sitting. I had to stand up and say: "So and so, I give you an hour's arrest." And he would say: "Yes, sir, an hour's arrest."

I could give them up to ten hours if I liked.

On Sunday the boy would hand his belt in to the commander on duty, and coming into my office say: "I have come to take my punishment."

And since he was there I could not let him go, because in 1933 the general meeting had deprived me of the right to forgive. Quite right too, because there'd hardly be any order if I punished someone one minute and forgave him the next day. So I could not forgive him, and he stayed in my office doing something. I alone had the right to talk to him,

no one else had, and talking about his offence was also out. It was considered poor taste, it would have been tactless of me to broach the subject. He was under arrest, he was taking it like a man, and rubbing it in would have been frankly indecent.

As a rule we talked about the Commune's affairs, factory matters, and so on. I had not the right to remind him that he was under arrest or look at my watch to see how long he had been there, because he himself was supposed to organise his arrest. It suited me very well that the matter was entrusted to him.

You cannot know what this arrest was like. They had to spend the whole of their day off sitting in my office, talking to me.

The girls were strangely horrified at the very thought of arrest—it meant being disgraced before the whole Commune. And so the girl-communards, who had the FED badge, took care never to get arrested.

One day I put a smart, pretty girl, a detachment commander, under arrest for two hours, and all that time she sat weeping in my office: how was she to face the general meeting now? Incidentally, she is a tragic actress at the Kharkov theatre at present. Arrest means the application of the theorem I have mentioned earlier: the utmost demands combined with the utmost respect for a person, and with us arrest was a sacred thing.

When I was urgently called to Kiev by telegram and had to leave the Commune within the hour, I had no more than thirty minutes in which to say good-bye to the collective with which I had spent eight years. I could not say anything, of course, it was as difficult for me to speak as it was for them. The girls cried, everyone was in a state of nervous shock, but still a reflex was occasioned just the same. I interrupted my farewell speech, noticing dust on the piano top, and said: "Who's on theatre duty today?"

"The first detachment."

"Five hours' arrest for the commander."

He was my old friend. We had spent all those eight years together. But why the dust? He had overlooked it, and so he got five hours' arrest.

I left, and when I returned two months later for inspection, the boy came to my office and said:

"I've come to take my punishment."

"What for?"

"For the dust on the piano."

"But why didn't you do your punishment before now?"

"I wanted to do it with you here."

And so I was obliged to sit there with him for five hours!

So much for the form.

If a collective is united in its general tone and there is trust, punishment can be a very original and interesting thing, that is, if it is the general meeting which imposes it.

Once at a general meeting a senior Komsomol member cursed the instructor. The boy was right, but the language he used was foul. And so the general meeting decided: "To have Young Pioneer Kirenko (the youngest boy of all) explain to Komsomol member so and so the rules of behaviour."

They meant it. After the meeting, the commander on duty called in Kirenko and the senior boy and said: "Sit down and listen."

Kirenko tackled the task earnestly, and the senior boy listened as earnestly.

At the next meeting, Kirenko reported:

"Young Pioneer Kirenko reports fulfilment of the general meeting's assignment."

"Did you understand what Kirenko told you?"

"I did."

"Go then."

It all ended there.

One other case: a communard who was out taking a walk with a girl-communard saw some people fighting. Tempted, he joined in. The whole thing ended in plenty of trouble for him. The general meeting's resolution said: "So and so must think over his action for five minutes at 3 p.m. next day off, and report to the commander."

He had to think his action over, whether he liked it or not. It gave him enough food for a week's thought. And he did draw the right conclusions, reporting them as ordered.

This sort of punishment, in imposing which the collective effortlessly demonstrates its power, is really more of a stimulus than anything else. In my practice, however, the main thing was not punishment, of course, but talks of an individual nature.

LECTURE THREE

Methods of Individual Approach

Today I meant to discuss with you the question of individual influence, the pedagogy of individual approach. The transition from collective influence, from the organisation of the collective to the organisation of the individual was something I took an erroneous view of in my first years of work. I believed that influencing the collective as a body came first, and influencing individuals as a corrective to the development of that body came second.

As I gained in experience I became profoundly convinced, and this conviction was later confirmed in practice, that there is no such thing as a direct transition from a collective to an individual. The transition takes place through a primary collective specially organised for an educational purpose.

I think that in future pedagogics will pay special attention to the theory of the primary collective. How is one to understand the term—primary collective?

The term can apply to a collective the members of which are in constant business, friendly and ideological association. It is what at one time our pedagogical theory proposed calling the "contact" collective.

In our schools we do have these, of course. They are the grade or the form, and perhaps their only shortcoming is that they do not play the role of a primary collective, that is, a link between the individual and the school collective,

and very often they are the final collective. I saw this in some schools, but I did not always see a school collective as such.

The conditions I had were more favourable, since my communards lived in and worked there, and thus had many logical and practical reasons for taking an interest in the affairs of the whole collective and live by its interests. But then I did not have a natural primary collective, which a school form is. I was obliged to create it. Later, we had a full ten-year school and I could have based my work on a primary collective of the school-form type. But I did not take this course. A form unites children in their everyday work and this leads to their isolating themselves from the rest of the school. The reasons for them to shut themselves in in their form interests are too many and too sound. And so in later years I gave up the idea of building up a primary collective according to a school-form pattern or even a work-team pattern. My attempts to organise a commune made up of primary collectives, united by such strong links as school form and production work, yielded sad results. This type of primary collective always tends to withdraw from the interests of the collective generally and become isolated. If this happens, it loses its value as a primary collective, it consumes the interests of the school collective and makes transition to the higher stage rather difficult.

I came to this conclusion through my mistakes—mistakes which affected my educational work. I have the right to speak about it because I see the same thing happening in many schools where the interests of the primary collective prevail.

Collective education cannot be achieved through primary (contact) collectives only, because the unity of such a collective, where the children see each other all day long and live in friendly co-operation, engenders nepotism and leads to a type of education that cannot be called quite Soviet education. Only through a large collective, whose interests come not from simple association but from a more profound

social synthesis, can the transition be made to a broad political education where the word "collective" means the whole Soviet society.

The danger of letting youngsters form a small closed collective is that theirs will be a group and not a broad political education.

I finally organised things in such a way that the primary collective was a cell which received its school and work interests from other groups. That is why, towards the end I decided on breaking up the pupils into detachments comprised of boys and girls belonging to different forms and different work teams.

I realise perfectly that the logic of this pattern will not seem convincing enough to you. I do not have the time to go into detailed explanations, and so I will briefly set out some of the circumstances. For instance, there was the question of age grouping. I wondered how it worked, so I studied it in statistics, in action, in behaviour. At first, I too was all for building up the primary collectives from children of the same age. Partly because of their school interests.

This would seem to place the youngsters, isolated from seniors, in a more natural and correct environment. At that age (11 or 12) they ought to belong to one collective, with their own interests and organisations, and this I believed was the soundest pedagogical point of view. I was also influenced by pedagogical literature which maintained that age-grouping was one of the most important things in education.

But then I saw that youngsters, isolated from other age groups, were in actual fact placed in an artificial environment. They were deprived of the constant influence of older boys and girls, there was no handing down of experience, they received no moral or aesthetic incentive from their older brothers, from people who were more experienced and efficient, and who, in a certain sense, were a model for the youngsters to copy.

When I tried, by way of an experiment, to unite different age groups, I found I was doing much better. And that was

the form I decided on. In the last seven or eight years my detachments always included some of the oldest, most experienced, well read and politically developed Komsomol members, and some of the youngest children. A collective such as this, made up of different age groups, gave a much better educational effect, and what is more it was manoeuvrable and smart, easy for me to manage.

A collective made up of youngsters of an age always tends to shut itself up in its own shell of interests peculiar to that given age, to withdraw from me, their guide, and from the rest of the collective. Say, all of them are keen on skating; this keenness naturally shuts them in into a precinct entirely their own. But if my collective is made up of different age groups, the life it lives and the hobbies it pursues follow a more intricate pattern, requiring greater effort from both its older and younger members, making higher demands upon them, and, consequently, producing a more desirable educational effect.

In later years I practised the principle "who wants to be with whom" when forming collectives of different age groups. The boldness of this venture frightened me at first, but then I saw that it was the most natural and wholesome set-up, provided that this natural primary collective included youngsters from different school forms and work teams.

Thus I reached the irrevocable decision that this was the best way.

A detachment was a voluntary union of ten or twelve people. The union was formed gradually, of course. In the Commune there were always boys with whom no one wanted to join up of their own free will. A circumstance which helped me to identify the difficult cases. There were about fifteen to twenty such boys in our collective of five hundred who would not be taken on voluntarily by any of the detachments. There were fewer difficult girls, no more than three or four out of the total 150, although girls are usually less friendly than boys. The reason for this discrepancy was that the boys were rather more principled than the girls and also given

to exaggeration, refusing to take on this or that person, because he'd ruin their skates or bully the younger kids or something. The girls took a more optimistic view, they were quicker to agree to admit a doubtful character to their midst, hoping they'd be able to reform him.

What did I do in such cases? I brought the unwanted boys to the general meeting and said:

"Here are the fifteen people no detachment wants to take on. Zemlyanoi here wanted to join the first detachment but was refused. He tried the second, but was rejected again. He approached the fifteenth detachment, and the same thing happened. What are we to do?"

A debate ensued. A detachment commander would stand up and say:

"What's the big idea refusing to take him on? Why did the first, second and fifteenth detachments reject him? We want an explanation from them."

The explanation would be brief.

"Take him into your fourteenth detachment, if that's the way you feel about it. Make him your responsibility and you're welcome to the bother."

"We had nothing to do with him," an answer would come back. "He went to you. He's so-and-so's buddy. You bragged you'd make something of him."

It turned out that no detachment would take him on.

I had to "earn my bread" then. It was obviously both unpleasant and difficult for the detachment which refused to take the boy, especially since no one made any definite charge against him and simply said: let some other detachment take him on. And there stood the boy, rejected by the collective.

He would then try to persuade them, swearing he'd be good and promising to do wonderful things in the future. Well, the matter had to be settled one way or another. And then the leaders—members of the Komsomol bureau and detachment commanders—would have their say, suggesting where to put the boy. As a rule all this talk led nowhere.

They would drop Zemlyanoi and start discussing Ivanov, Romanchenko, Petrenko and the rest of the fifteen, trying to squeeze one boy into each of the fifteen detachments.

A new process began. Every detachment would try to get the most passable of the fifteen boys. A break was made after which one of the commanders would say: "I'll take so and so."

The most passable boy was now a prize competed for by all the other detachments, and the very same Zemlyanoi, whom nobody wanted at first, was now craved by all, because Petrenko, Shapovalov and the rest were even worse.

Say the first detachment got him.

"You are responsible for him," we told them. "You wanted him, and so you'll answer for him."

We would go on to the next candidate. He was the best of the remaining fourteen, and again the detachments fought for possession of him. And so it went on, until there were only Voskoboinikov and Shapovalov left. And here again the remaining two detachments tried to grab the lesser of the two evils.

In the process of distribution I was able to study all the unwanted boys well. They formed a community apart as far as I was concerned. I kept them in mind all the time, and I knew that those fifteen boys were my most dangerous group. They had no crimes on their record, but still it was very important for me to know that the collective had not wanted to take them into its midst.

The boys and girls sensed what Petrenko was at bottom, and their not wanting to admit him to their detachment meant that he warranted my particular attention. The fact that the detachment which took him eventually made itself responsible for him was a great help to me.

That is how our primary collectives were formed. Some very intricate instrumentation had to be done, of course, to get the best use out of the collective. The tone and style of the detachment's work needed the most attuning.

What is a primary collective, a detachment? In our practical work at the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune we arrived at the following rule: we, that is myself as head of the Commune, the bodies of self-government, the Komsomol bureau, the council of commanders, and the general meeting, tried to have no dealings with separate individuals. That is, officially. I find it very difficult to prove this logic to you. I have called it the logic of parallel educational influence. It is so difficult for me to explain because I have never written anything about it and never sought or found any formulas.

What is parallel educational influence?

We dealt only with the detachment. We had no dealings with the individual. Such was the official formula. In actual fact we dealt with the individual, but we asserted that we were not concerned with the individual.

To explain. We did not want every separate individual to feel that he was an object of education. The way I saw it was that here's a twelve or fifteen year old living and enjoying life, getting some joy out of it and accumulating experience and impressions. As far as we are concerned he is an object of education, but as far as he is concerned he is a living person, and it will not serve me well to try and convince him that he is not a person, only a person in the making, that he is not a living thing but an *object* pedagogically speaking.

I tried to convince him that I was more a teacher who was teaching him to read and write than an educator; that I was helping him to learn a trade, that I appreciated his contribution to the production process, that I realised he was a citizen, and that I was an older comrade guiding his life with his help and his participation. I took care not to make him feel that he was no more than a pupil, no more than an object of education, of no social or personal worth. But actually to me he was just that.

It was the same with a detachment. We insisted that a detachment was a small Soviet cell faced with big social

tasks. It was up to the detachment to try and elevate the Commune to the highest possible state. It had to help the ex-communards, help the one-time strays who came to the Commune and needed assistance.

The detachment had to be public-spirited and act as the primary cell in social work and life.

Together with my teaching staff we came to the conclusion that an individual needed very careful adjusting to his environment to make him feel himself a citizen, a person, above all else. In our subsequent work this became a tradition.

Petrenko came late to work. The matter was reported to me that same evening. I called in the commander of his detachment and said:

"One of you was late to work."

"Yes. It was Petrenko."

"See it doesn't happen again."

"It won't happen again."

But then Petrenko was late again. I summoned the detachment.

"It's the second time your Petrenko came late to work."

I ticked off the whole detachment. They promised it would not happen again. I said: "You may go."

I watched to see what would happen. I knew they would take Petrenko to task, and make enormous demands upon him as a member of their detachment, as a member of the whole collective.

The meetings of the council of commanders were attended by commanders elected by the general meeting. But it made no difference who came—the commander himself or some member of his detachment. Such was our rule. We made sure that all the detachments were represented. First detachment, present? Present, but so and so is representing the commander who is busy. This person had the right to attend and speak for his detachment and its commander.

Another example: Volkov stole something. He was dealt with personally, but it was the detachment and not Volkov

that was given a bad mark. The detachment was entirely responsible for the fact that one of its members had committed a theft.

To go on. Supposing ten out of the twelve members of a detachment had excellent showings. The detachment would move up to first place. It received certain privileges, a bonus or, perhaps, was given tickets for several shows at the opera theatre. We had some tickets every day. Well, the whole detachment would go: the ones with good showings and the few whose marks were quite bad. They benefited by what the detachment had earned.

It would seem unfair, but actually it worked very well, because it made the pupil with the bad marks feel awkward going to the theatre with the excellent ten or eleven. He had not earned it, he was benefiting by what the others had earned, and it placed him under an unspoken moral obligation. The next month he would strive for excellent showings himself.

Sometimes a boy like that would come to me and say:

"Transfer me to another detachment. All of our chaps have excellent showings except me. They're all going to the theatre and they say they'll take me along rather than throw the ticket away, and I don't want to go."

This advancement of the individual against the background of the detachment helped us a great deal.

If out of the twelve, five were good or up to standard and seven were such a drag on the detachment that they pulled it down to the bottom of the ladder, the whole detachment was answerable for it.

We had from 35 to 45 detachments all in all. Every month their indices were added up and the detachments placed. There was a special diagram showing this. On the 2nd of every month there was a meeting at which the previous month's winners ceremoniously handed the banner over to the detachment which had taken their place. It was a gorgeous, splendid banner made specially for the purpose and kept in the dormitory of the best detachment.

The detachments also competed in orderliness, discipline, and so on. Results were announced every six days. The seven best detachments were given theatre tickets. We had 31 tickets every day. The way we distributed them was this: the best detachment got 7 tickets, the next one 6, the third 5, and so on down the grade. In other words, the best detachment got seven tickets every day for six days, the next one 6, and so on. We did not care who got the tickets, whether it was the ones who pulled the detachment up or those who dragged it down. It was the business of the detachment and none of ours. Everyone went. A bus came for them every evening, and those who had tickets got in. The commander on duty made sure they all had tickets, were dressed properly and had a ruble on them to buy some refreshment. Those going to the theatre had to answer the three requirements: ticket, appearance and ruble, and no one asked them if they ranked first or last in their detachment.

Such was the significance of the detachment in all other matters as well. Take the distribution of the cleaning jobs. We had no cleaners, but the premises had to be kept spick and span in view of the fact that the Commune, being so conveniently situated, was always receiving our own and foreign delegations. In 1935, for instance, we had our two-hundredth Intourist delegation. It was a spur to us, of course, to keep the place in perfect order, but cleaning, polishing floors, brass door handles and mirrors, always having fresh flowers, and all the rest of it was a huge job, and since we had no specially employed people to cope with it, the communards themselves had to do all the work. All the five hundred of them did cleaning from a quarter past six till a quarter to seven every morning.

It took a lot of organising to get this work to run smoothly. A certain amount of experience was needed. Efficiency was attained by dividing the work up among the detachments six months ahead. There can be no shifting about. One detachment got a pail, a mop, and a floor brush, another one got everything necessary for polishing floors, a third for cleaning

toilets, a fourth for polishing and dusting the assembly hall, etc. The standing of a detachment was taken into consideration when dividing the work. The best one, for instance, got the toilet to clean, which took twelve minutes, and the lowest ranking detachment got the assembly hall which took a very long time to do properly, all the members working in the sweat of their brow, so to speak. As a rule the lowest ranking detachment was given the cleanest but the most labour-consuming job, and, mind you, if it was not done properly the commander alone would be punished. He was put under arrest as punishment for the inefficiency of his detachment, and we did not bother to ask exactly who forgot to dust the radiator.

In all matters, the detachment was the body which I, as head of the Commune, came into closest contact with. But it was a very difficult business for me to make a careful study of the detachment's psyche. It is here that the personality of the tutor attached to the detachment comes to the fore. But of this later.

I could go on speaking about the significance of the primary collective, but I have not the time. There is one more thing I want to say. In school we have less opportunity of advancing the primary collective. Some other method is indicated. But nevertheless I maintain that a primary collective must not push the school collective into the background or substitute for it, and my second thesis is that contact with the individual must be made chiefly through the primary collective. Such is my theorem in general terms, and when it comes to details a commune must approach it in one way and a school in quite another.

Officially we came in touch with the individual only through the primary collective. Such was the idea. But actually the individual pupil came first with us.

How did my colleagues and I organise work with the pupils, with the different personalities?

To work with a pupil one has to know him well and cultivate him. If in my imagination I had seen those per-

sonalities scattered like so many peas outside the bounds of the collective, if I had approached them without this collective yardstick, I would never have managed them.

I had five hundred different personalities. An important circumstance. The first year, I made the usual beginner's mistake. I turned my attention to personalities which were misfits in the collective. Mistakenly I directed my attention to the most dangerous characters and occupied myself with them. Naturally, it was the thieves, the hooligans, the collective's antagonists and those who wanted to run away—in other words those whom the collective would anyway cast off and drop—who engaged my attention. Naturally, I watched them particularly. I did it in the firm belief that I was a pedagogue and that I knew how to handle different personalities. I called everyone in in turn, talked, persuaded, and so on.

I changed the tone of my work in later years. I realised that the most dangerous characters were not those who made themselves conspicuous, but those who hid from me.

What made me think so? By that time I had already graduated fifteen groups, and following their careers closely I saw that many of those whom I had thought dangerous and bad were doing well, meeting life on the right terms as Soviet people should, and though they did make mistakes sometimes, as a product of education I found them quite satisfactory. Some of the boys who used to hide from me, making themselves unnoticeable in the collective, were taking a philistine attitude to life: they married too early, built a "pretty nest", squeezed themselves into soft jobs by various means, resigned from the Komsomol, severed all ties with society, and turned into small nondescript creatures, with no telling "what they are" or "how they smell". In some cases I even noticed signs of a slow but deep-seated decay. Those whose ambitions stopped at building a home and feeding up pigs, those who stopped attending meetings and reading the newspapers, were quite likely to get involved in shady deals one fine day.

I came to the profound conviction that it was the ones who hid from me and kept out of my way, who made the most dangerous characters requiring my particular attention.

Incidentally, it was the communards themselves who started me thinking about it. In some cases they were quite outspoken in assuring me that the ones who kept to themselves, cramming all day (they'd probably go on cramming or fixing their radios even if a fire broke out), never speaking at meetings, never voicing an opinion, were the worst of the lot, the most dangerous, because they were clever and shrewd enough to keep out of the way, pursue their own quiet course, and go out into life intact and unconvinced.

When I had made some headway, when I had got over the shock of theft and hooliganism, I realised that the aim of my educational work was not putting two or three hooligans and thieves straight, but rearing a definite type of citizen, moulding a militant, active, efficient character, and that this positive aim could only be achieved if I trained the whole collective and not merely put straight the odd individual who needed straightening.

Some teachers make the same mistake in school, too. There are teachers who think it their duty to concentrate on difficult or backward pupils, leaving the so-called "normal" ones to carry on by themselves. But the question is: what are they carrying on and where will it carry them?

The communards helped me even in their terminology. It was the council of commanders and not I who made a regular analysis of the collective, posting it up for all the Commune to know. To myself I divided the communards into two groups: 1) the doing activists, and 2) the reserve.

The doing activists are the ones who lead the Commune, that's obvious to all. They respond to every question with feeling, passion, conviction and demands. They lead the Commune in the ordinary sense of the word. But in case of emergency, danger, or the launching of a major campaign they always have their reserve to fall back on, not really

called the active yet, not commanders, but quick to render assistance. This is the reserve which eventually takes over from the doing activists.

Then, there were boys and girls whom I noted down as the healthily passive group. They wanted time to grow up, but in the meantime they attended hobby circles, went in for sports, contributed to the wall newspaper, and obediently followed the seniors.

I had a few people whom I called the rotting activists. They were our detachment commanders, members of commissions and the Komsomol bureau, but it was obvious to me and the rest simply from the expression of their eyes and their gait—we needed no facts—that they were playing a subtle and clever game. Doing something underhand here, slandering someone there, dodging work, getting a small boy to wipe their machine tools for them, and so it went on; decay set in when they started abusing their privileged standing, shirking work and using a lordly tone. Sometimes this decay assumes quite ominous proportions. You could smell alcohol on their breath, and we were merciless where drinking was concerned. The law at the Commune was: first time drunk, out you go!

I would ask the boy for an explanation.

"I had a glass of beer in town," he would say.

"Drinking a glass of beer is no crime, but I suspect it wasn't beer."

So much for the rotting activists. We did not formally list people in that category, but the Komsomol secretary and two or three other Komsomol members knew that some sort of decay had set in.

And finally there was a group which some communards called "the rabble". You had to keep a sharp eye on them and see they didn't pick your pocket. They might do anything: break open and rob a safe, or get into the factory and steal spare parts. Usually they were newcomers belonging to the senior age group. We had fifteen or twenty of them at a time. Even if they didn't do anything wrong, everyone knew that

they were "the rabble" and if they weren't watched they would be sure to do something bad.

And now for the term "bog" which we took from the French Revolution. This applied to a group of fifty or so who stumbled along somehow, fulfilled their norms half-heartedly, and there was no knowing what they lived by, what their hearts and their minds were on.

Watching this group making progress was the most pleasant and gladdening thing. Say, Petrov or someone was in the "bog": we'd tell him that he was, that he wasn't doing anything, not interested in anything, that he was dull, inefficient and indifferent to everything. And then the detachment would try to wake him up. Before long you'd see him displaying initiative, taking an interest in something, displaying initiative again, and there he would be promoted to the reserve or the healthy passive.

Our whole task was to root out the "bog" and "rabble" categories.

We launched a direct attack on the "rabble". There were no subtleties here. It was a frontal attack. The "rabble" was given a talking to for every trifling offence, and brought before the general meeting. To cope with this job we had to be determined and exacting.

The more difficult categories, i.e., the "bog" and the rotting activists, called for an individual approach and a variety of methods.

We shall now deal with individual approach. The collective of tutors and teachers plays the most important role here. It is very difficult to define their task in accurate enough terms. This, perhaps, is the greatest problem in our pedagogy. In our pedagogical literature the word "tutor" appears in the singular in more cases than not: "the tutor must be this and that", "the tutor must do this and that", or "the tutor must speak in such and such a manner".

I cannot imagine how pedagogy could count on the lone tutor. Naturally we'd find things difficult without this gifted tutor, capable of managing the pupils, and possessing a keen

eye, perseverance, intelligence, experience—a good tutor, in other words. But when we have thirty-five million children and teenagers to educate, can we stake everything on the chance that such tutors will be available?

Leaving this to chance means accepting that a good tutor will provide good education and a poor tutor will provide poor education. Has anyone tried to count the number of gifted and giftless tutors? And then, of course, a tutor has to be well educated himself. What sort of upbringing must he have, what sort of person must he be, what should his aims and interests be? No one has ever counted the tutors who fail to meet these requirements. . . .

And yet we are staking everything on the tutors alone.

Since in the course of my life I have been obliged to deal mainly with the aims and problems of upbringing, I know what it means to be landed with poorly brought up tutors and how the work suffers from it. It was a waste of years and effort for me, because it is exceedingly foolish to expect such a person to do any useful upbringing for us. Later, I came to the conclusion that it is better to have no tutor at all than one who has had a poor upbringing himself. I thought it was better to have four gifted tutors than forty giftless and ill-educated ones. I have seen how they work with my own eyes. What results could their work be expected to yield? Nothing but the disintegration of the collective. There could be no other results.

It follows that the choice of tutor is a matter of primary importance. How make that choice? For some reason little attention is paid to this matter. It is the prevalent opinion with us that any person, anyone at all, can be a tutor if he is appointed to the job and paid a tutor's salary. And yet it is a most difficult job, perhaps the most responsible job in the long run, demanding of a person not merely maximum effort, but also strength of character and uncommon ability.

No one did so much harm to my work, no one knocked out of true the structure it had taken me years to build as

badly as a poor tutor. And so in later years I adopted a firm line to work without them or to use only those that were really capable. Naturally, it made extra work for me.

Then I gave up the idea of tutors altogether. I usually sought the help of school teachers, but I had to train them first. I am convinced that teaching a person to bring up youngsters is as easy as teaching him arithmetic, say, or reading, or operating a lathe, and so teach them I did.

How did I go about it? First of all a tutor's character, behaviour, special knowledge and his training have to be organised. Otherwise he will not make a good tutor and do useful work. He must know how to use his voice, how to speak to youngsters, and what and when to say to them. This training is essential. A tutor who cannot control his facial expression or his moods is no good. He must know how to walk, joke, appear gay or angry, and he must be able to handle the pupils. He must behave in such a way that his every movement would be educative, and he must always know exactly what he wants or does not want. If he does not know this, how can he educate others?

I am convinced that in future our teachers' colleges will introduce such compulsory subjects as voice training, posture, control of one's movements and facial expression, otherwise I cannot imagine a tutor coping with his task. Tutors need to have their voices trained not merely to sing beautifully or speak, but to express their thoughts and feelings with the utmost precision, authority and imperiousness. All these are matters of educational technique.

For instance, you must know in what tone of voice to give a scolding, how far your anger or indignation may be shown, what right you have to show it at all, and if you do—in what way. All this is, in fact, education. A pupil apprehends your feelings and your thoughts not because he knows what is going on in your heart, but because he is watching you and listening to you. Watching a play we admire the actors on

the stage, and their beautiful acting gives us aesthetic pleasure. Well, here the pupil is watching too, but the actors he is watching are tutors, and the impact has to be educative.

I cannot dwell longer on this matter. The important thing is for a tutor to tackle his job consciously and actively.

Secondly, no tutor has the right to play a lone hand, to act at his own risk and on his own responsibility. There has to be a collective of educators, they have to be united, working according to a single plan, adopting the same tone and the same approach to pupils. Otherwise there can be no educational process to speak of. Therefore, it is better to have five weak tutors, united and inspired by the same thoughts, principles and style of work, than ten good educators with all of them working on their own in any way they see fit.

There can be many different distortions here. I suppose you know what a favourite teacher is. Now, I'm a school teacher, and supposing I begin to imagine that I'm everyone's favourite. Without myself noticing it I begin to pursue a certain policy. I am liked, and so I want to keep the pupils' affection, I try to be well loved by them. There I am, the favourite teacher, and all the rest are no one's favourites.

What kind of educational process is this? The teacher has already divorced himself from the collective. He fancies himself so well liked that he can afford to work any way it pleases him.

I respected my helpers–some of them were absolutely brilliant in their work–but I tried to convince them that becoming the favourite teacher should be the least of their ambitions. Personally, I never tried to win the children's affection, and in my opinion this affection, encouraged by the teacher for his own pleasure, is a crime. Maybe some of the communards are attached to me, but since my main task was to make citizens and real people out of the five hundred boys and girls in my charge, I did not see why I should make it more complicated by fostering in them a hysterical sort of love for my own self.

This coquetry, this chasing after popularity, this boasting of their belovedness does a lot of harm to teachers and pupils both. I have persuaded myself and my comrades that there is no room for this sort of thing in our life.

Let them grow attached to you little by little, without any effort on your part. But if a teacher sees this affection as an end in itself, it can do only harm. If he does not seek this affection, he can be exacting and fair to his pupils and to himself.

Correct upbringing can be achieved only by a collective of educators united in their common views and convictions, mutually helpful, and free from jealousy, free from a craving to endear themselves personally to the pupils. That is why I warmly welcome the news, which our newspapers have published, that the People's Commissariat of Public Education is giving serious consideration to the problem of enhancing the authority and power of headmasters and directors of studies who would co-ordinate the work of the teaching staff.

A short while ago the Sovietsky Pisatel Publishers sent me a manuscript to read. The author is a Moscow teacher. The book is written in the first person, it tells about a schoolmistress, the staff, the pupils, and covers the period of a school year.

At the publishing house opinion on this book differed sharply. Some dismissed it as cheap and shoddy, while others proclaimed it wonderful: I was called in as an arbiter.

If I were to recommend the publication of this story, it would only be for a definite purpose. The schoolmistress portrayed in it is such a disgusting person that, actually, it would do people a world of good to read it and see what a schoolmistress should *not* be like. But the author is full of admiration for her.

This pedagogical fake's only care is to win the pupils' "love". All the parents are awful people, she has nothing but contempt for them, she calls all parents and families "dull, drab things", while she herself is a pedagogue with

a capital P, if you please. All her fellow teachers are rotters to a man: one can't see clearly for vanity, another takes no interest in anything, a third is a schemer, and a fourth is just lazy; the headmaster is sluggish and stupid. She alone is perfect.

What's more, all this stuff is written in the nastiest tone. The book is full of tender sighing, a pining for love *à la* Verbitskaya, a chasing after affection, and the pupils are described in a most unpleasant manner. And another thing: the peculiar unwholesome attention to matters of sex.

The plot, I suppose, boils down to this: a boy looked at a girl in a special way, the girl wrote him a note, and she, the great pedagogue, brilliantly smashed these attempts at falling in love, and earned everyone's gratitude.

Her type of pedagogical fakes who flirt with themselves even when alone, who flirt with their pupils and society, cannot educate anyone. The only way to make responsible, serious educators of the school teachers is to unite them into a collective, rally them round the central figure–the headmaster. This is also a very serious problem which our pedagogues should pay more attention to.

If such great demands are to be made on the educator, then even greater demands must be made on the person who unites the educators into a collective.

The length of time a collective of teachers works together is a most important condition, and I think our pedagogues do not take this matter seriously enough. If, on the average, five years is what a communard stays with us, then a tutor should also do five years' service at the Commune at the very least. It should be made a rule, because in a really close-knit collective, whose life is settled and runs a proper course, a newcomer is always a newcomer, whether he is a pupil or a tutor. And it is a mistake to imagine that a tutor who has just joined the staff will be able to give the pupils anything. The success of a tutor depends on how long he has been on the staff, how much energy and effort he has put into the shaping of the collective; if the collective of teachers is

younger than that of the pupils it will be rather feeble. This does not mean at all that only old men should be taken on the staff. It is up to our pedagogues to study the peculiarities of impact made by old teachers and beginners, and strike a balance. Assembling a staff of teachers cannot be a chance or accidental thing, it has to be done intelligently. There must be a certain number of old, experienced teachers, and it is absolutely essential to include a young girl who has just graduated from college and has never yet taken an independent step. It is one of the mysteries of pedagogy: when a young girl fresh from college comes into an old collective of teachers and an old collective of pupils, an elusively subtle process, which makes education a success, is sure to begin. The girl will be learning from the old teachers and this will give them a sense of responsibility for her work.

The question of how many men and how many women should be on the staff needs serious thought. The prevalence of men creates an undesirable tone. And having too many women also results in a sort of one-sided development.

I should say that the looks of the teacher are also very important. It would be best, of course, if all teachers were handsome, but at any rate there simply must be one good-looking young man and one beautiful young woman on the staff.

This is the way I did it. Let us suppose I had twenty-two teachers and one vacancy. If all the twenty-two were plain like me, I'd choose a good-looking person to fill the vacancy. The pupils should admire the staff aesthetically also. Let them be a little infatuated. This will be the best sort of infatuation, not sexual but aesthetic, pleasantly visual.

The question of how many teachers should be gay and how many glum also needs deciding. I cannot picture a collective composed of gloomy people exclusively. There must be at least one cheery person, at least one wit. Regulations governing staff composition ought to fill a volume in the pedagogics of the future.

I had a teacher, Tersky* by name. It frightened me to think that someone might lure him away from me. He was an amazingly jovial person. He infected all of us–the pupils and myself–with his bubbling good humour. He lacked organisation, but I succeeded in making a real, splendid tutor of him. He did awful things sometimes. Once, when we were off to see an opera, I was surprised to see him carrying his year-old baby in his arms. "What are you bringing the baby for?" I asked him. "He's a year old, he's got to get used to good music!" And I said: "Take him when you're not with the communards."

He developed into a wonderful tutor. He was jolly every minute of the day, whatever he was doing, and he proved to be a wizard for devising games, quizzes, rebuses, and other things. Take the rebus–the picture puzzle covered half the wall. The genius of the man quite astonished me: how could anyone make up so many puzzles? There were all kinds of questions, short ones and long ones, funny and tricky ones, with pictures and diagrams. He did not devise them all himself, he had a hundred-and-fifty people or so working on the rebus, a proper editorial board, who hunted through the magazines, or made up the jokes themselves. There was method in the rebus. For instance, there would be a puzzle which, if solved correctly, would give the winner a thousand points. If one person solved it, he would get the thousand points, and the author of the puzzle would get the same. If a hundred people solved it, they got ten points each, the puzzle being obviously an easy one.

Tersky managed to draw all the communards into these games, firing the enterprise with his enthusiasm.

For instance, there was this puzzle once: "On Sunday find me at a spot 4 km away from the Commune in the north-

---

* Viktor Tersky–Merited Teacher of the R.S.F.S.R., who had worked with A. S. Makarenko at both the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune. He is the author of *Hobbies and Games in A. S. Makarenko's Practice* and *A School Game to Match Wits*, which are popular with Soviet teachers. In his novels Makarenko calls him Persky.

easterly direction. I'll have a curious object in my right pocket. The finder will get a thousand points."

And so on Sunday the communards started out in a body to look for Tersky, taking their compasses and their lunch with them. I had to put dinner back, because they were still looking for him somewhere to the north-east of the Commune.

It is quite impossible to enumerate all the interesting things he did! Another time, he challenged them: "On such and such a date at such and such an hour you must untie the shoe-laces of Solomon Borisovich Kogan, our production manager. The person who succeeds in doing it will get so many points."

Solomon Borisovich was a man of substance, a dignified person, running to fat. He had already read the notice and was indignant. At 3 p.m. the communards surrounded him. "What, are you going to assault me? No, that's not the way," he said to them.

He was right, it was not the way. Cunning had to be used. And one of the boys did manage to untie his shoe-laces.

Tersky was bubbling over with energy, and he had a way of keeping the youngsters busy all the time.

One day he suddenly announced to the Commune at large:

"As a matter of fact, perpetual motion is possible to achieve. We could make a device, I believe, which would remain in motion for ever."

He sounded so confident and played his part so well that before you knew it, even the engineers and instructors, carried away by his idea, all got down to work on the device.

"What's the big idea?" I asked Tersky. "Everyone knows that no such device can be made."

"Never mind, let them try," he answered. "Maybe one of them will make it."

And I found myself almost believing that perpetual motion could be achieved.

On the other hand, the staff must have someone who never

smiles, who is very stern, a person who never forgives a fault and who cannot be disobeyed.

I enjoyed myself tremendously sometimes. A young teacher, a girl fresh from college, would be on duty. The entire collective of pupils would be on the alert because there were always boys who'd try to make a fool of her, and she might need help.

"I was late to work because I have no shoes to wear," one of them would say.

She'd be flustered, not knowing what to do. And immediately the others would be on to him: "You be careful, we know you're lying."

A thing like this rallied the whole collective.

The next day, the stern educator would be on duty. He made his appearance at 6 a.m. sharp, he never let anyone oversleep, he merely had to open the door and twitch a moustache for everyone to know that there was no getting round him.

In my practical work I stuck to the principle that no pedagogue, tutor or teacher should have the right to punish, and I never gave anyone this right, even the right to scold. In the first place it is a very difficult thing to do. In the second, my considered opinion was that one person alone should have the right to punish, so there would be no confusion and no getting in each other's way. I admit that it made the work of the pedagogues more difficult still since they were obliged to rely solely on their authority over the pupils.

Talking about authority, many pedagogues are convinced that it is either a gift from God—a person is born with authority, everyone looks at him and knows he has it—or it is something that has to be artificially built up. That is why people so often say: "You shouldn't have ticked off the teacher in front of the pupils. You are undermining his authority."

Authority, I think, results from responsibility. If a person has a responsibility to bear and he bears it with honour,

he gains authority. It is according to this pattern that he must build up his authority, behaving accordingly.

The pedagogue must strive to establish the closest contact with the primary collective, to make the best friends with it and guide it as an older comrade. Pedagogical instrumentation is altogether an intricate and lengthy procedure. For instance, if a pupil violated discipline, displaying the bad in him, I insisted that the pedagogue should first of all get the detachment to investigate. It is part of the educator's work to stimulate the detachment's activity, to encourage the collective to be more exacting towards the individual.

I cannot dwell longer on the methods of the educators' work, it would take up too much time, so I will merely tell you how I myself, working as an educator, approached different personalities.

In dealing with an individual I preferred the frontal attack, and recommended it to others. To illustrate: if a boy did something bad, despicable, I told him so: "Your action was despicable."

That famous pedagogical tact, of which so much is being written, should really mean the sincerity of your opinion: I will not permit myself to hide anything, to sugar the pill, I say what I really think. It is the most sincere, simple, easy and effective way, but it so happens that it is not always right to speak.

I think talk helps least of all. If I saw that my talking did no good, I said no more.

Say, a boy insulted a girl. I found out about it. Should I talk to him? The important thing for me was to have him understand without my talking to him. And so I wrote him a note and sent it to him in a sealed envelope.

I've got to tell you about those "liaison officers" of mine. They were boys of ten or so, sharp-eyed and smart. They always knew where anyone was to be found. These liaison officers had an important part to play. I would hand one of them the envelope which contained my note: "Com. Yevstigneyev, please come to my office at 11 p.m. tonight."

The boy knew perfectly well what was in the note, he knew what was wrong and why I was calling in Yevstigneyev, in short, he knew all the inside story but did not let on to me that he did. "Take the note to Yevstigneyev," I said to him. And not another word.

I knew what would happen. He would come into the dining-room and say: "A note for you."

"What's that?"

"Anton Semyonovich wants you."

"What for?"

"I'll tell you. Remember insulting that girl yesterday?"

And the liaison officer would come for him at 10.30 p.m.

"You ready?"

"I'm ready."

"It's time you went."

Sometimes the boy, let's call him Yevstigneyev, was unable to stand it until 11 p.m. and came to my office at 3 in the afternoon.

"Did you call me, Anton Semyonovich?"

"Not now, at 11 p.m."

He would go back to his detachment, and everyone would ply him with questions: "What's up? Getting hell?" "Yeah." "What for?"

And until 11 p.m. they'd give him hell in the detachment. He'd come to my office at the appointed hour looking pale and unnerved by what he had gone through that day.

"Have you understood everything?" I'd ask him.

"I have."

"Go then."

There was no need to say more.

In other cases I acted differently. I'd tell the messenger: "Tell him to come at once."

And when he came I'd tell him all I thought of him. But I would not bother to talk to him at all if he was a difficult character who did not trust me, was antagonistic to me and treated me with some suspicion. Instead I would call the seniors together, summon the boy and address him in the

most formal, agreeable of tones. What mattered to me was not what I said but how the others looked at him. He faced me squarely enough, but he was afraid to meet the eyes of his comrades.

"Your comrades will now explain things to you," I'd say.

They would proceed to tell him what I had taught them, and he would imagine that it was all their own idea.

A special method had to be used sometimes. There were cases when I had to call in the whole detachment, but in order not to make it too obvious that I was summoning the whole detachment to put one single person straight, I invited them to come and have tea with me. I offered them tea, cakes and lemonade. As a rule I had one detachment to tea every week. And as a rule no one knew what it was all about and was frightfully intrigued. As they drank tea, joked and chatted, they wondered which of them was the culprit. Sometimes I would not even give them a hint. And if in the course of conversation the culprit gave himself away they'd pounce on him right there and then. After tea they would go back to their dormitory in a good mood and disposed to do good.

"Everything was fine, and there you went and let us down!" they would say.

A week later I would invite the same detachment to tea again. They understood that it was a test, that I wanted to see what had been done. And they would tell me themselves how they had talked to the offender, making him promise to behave himself, and how they had appointed someone to look after him.

"Don't worry! Everything will be all right."

Sometimes it was a school form I invited to my tea parties.

Since no one knew when the next tea party would be and who would be invited, all the pupils made ready for it, keeping their clothes neat, just in case. (They used lotion for the occasion, too.) It worried them that they might

suddenly get an invitation to tea when things were not quite right in their detachment.

I remember one case: the tea party had just begun when suddenly an offence so gross came to light that the commander on duty suggested that they all stop eating and drinking. The punishment was well deserved. It was mortifying for the whole detachment with everyone teasing next day: "Enjoyed the tea party?"

All these are forms of individual treatment. These forms are especially important if the initiative belongs to the pupils themselves. Usually the boy or girl would come to me and say: "I've got to speak to you in private, it's a secret."

This is the friendliest and best of forms.

In some cases, however, I permitted myself to forego the frontal attack and try flanking instead. That was when the whole collective was set against one person. A frontal attack is not fair then, because the person has no protection on any side. With the collective set against him, and with me against him too, it may break him.

We had a girl called Lena, a sweet, good girl, but she had already been a streetwalker. We had a lot of trouble with her at first, but after a year with us she began to improve. And then one day her best friend discovered that someone had stolen fifty rubles from her locker. Everyone said that it was Lena's doing. I gave them permission to search her things. They did. The search yielded nothing. I suggested that the case be considered closed.

A few days later, however, the money was discovered in the reading-room stuck into the special gadget we had for bolting windows and hidden from view by the draperies. Some youngsters remembered seeing Lena wandering about from one window to the other and even holding something in her hand.

The council of commanders summoned her.

"You stole the money!"

I could see that they sincerely believed it. They demanded her expulsion for stealing. I also could see that there was

not a single person there who felt like sticking up for her, not even the girls who usually defended their sisters. Even they insisted on her being expelled, and I realised that she was indeed the thief. There was no doubt about it.

It was one of those cases when a flanking move had to be resorted to.

"No, you've no proof that it was Lena who stole the money," I told them. "I cannot allow her to be expelled."

They stared at me, surprised and indignant. And then I said:

"I am convinced that it was not Lena."

And while they all tried to prove to me that the thief was Lena, I tried as hard to prove to them that it was not.

"What makes you so sure?" they asked me.

"I know from her eyes."

I often did guess things from people's eyes, and they knew it.

Lena came to me the next day.

"Thank you for defending me, it was mean of them to go for me like that."

"How can you say this? You did steal the money, you know."

My move was so unexpected that her resistance broke. She burst out crying and admitted everything. But it was a secret only we two knew that I had lied at the general meeting to protect her, knowing full well that she was the thief. This secret delivered her into my hands completely and made her perfectly educable.

I lied. But I saw how relentless the collective was. They might have kicked her out, and to avert it I had to play this trick. I am against such flanking moves. It's a dangerous thing to do, but in the present case the girl appreciated the fact that I had deceived the general meeting to save her, she understood that we now shared a secret, and it made her completely malleable as an object of education. Such flanking moves are very difficult and hazardous. And one should only risk making them in extreme cases.

LECTURE FOUR

Work Training, Relations, Style and Tone

I want to dwell for a little on the question of work training before I go on to the concluding chapter on style and tone.

As you will remember, in the first years after the Revolution our school had been called the labour school, and all of us teachers had then been impressed not so much by the method as by the word "labour" itself and the labour principle which held a special fascination for us. The colony, of course, offered greater opportunities for introducing industrial training than the conventional school did, but in my sixteen years of work with the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzhinsky Commune I had to go through a difficult course of development in my attitude to the educative role of labour and the organisation of the labour processes, and even in my understanding of the labour process itself.

In 1920 I could never have pictured the 1935-36 set-up which obtained at the Dzerzhinsky Commune with its accent on labour.

I cannot confidently say that the course of labour organisation and its development which I followed was the right course, since I was unable to act independently in this field and had to comply with the many opinions and points of view of people who came in temporary contact with my work, introducing their own viewpoints, changes and forms.

Throughout the sixteen years I was obliged to go along with them and adapt myself to the circumstances in which I found myself. At the Gorky Colony I had to adapt myself to poverty more than anything else, and to introduce work for reasons of necessity, in conditions of need. At the Dzerzhinsky Commune I had to adapt myself to and even fight against tendencies started by my superiors.

There were periods in the history of my collective which I believe I have a certain right to call quite ideal. At the Dzerzhinsky Commune this was in 1930 or 1931.

Why do I call that period ideal? By then all my communards were already working at a real factory, that is to say, it was an enterprise with its own industrial and financial plan and its efficient organisation with all the forms of a real factory: a production planning department, a rate-setting office, an efficient interdependence between all the jobs, and a strictly kept record of manufactured parts showing quantity, rates of output and standards of quality.

At that time our factory was already a paying concern, covering its own expenses and those involved in the maintenance of the communards, and it was building up assets. It was a regular factory, I mean. The communards, however, received no wages. This, of course, is a debatable question, and it remains debatable to this day. I know of no other institution where such an experiment has ever been carried out.

I was against wages at that time. I believed in raising the productivity of labour by the simple means of convincing everyone that it was in the interests of the collective to do so, I believed in a steady labour enthusiasm, not the enthusiasm of an assault, not the enthusiasm for attaining the immediate goal of that week or that month, but a calm, steady enthusiasm for the collective's far perspectives which would spur the pupils on to the performance of enormous tasks, demanding of the pedagogue the full mobilisation of his mental, physical and ideological strength. . . . I considered an enthusiasm such as this of the greatest educational value,

and I had a profound conviction that wages would inevitably mar and break up to a certain extent this picture of moral well-being.

I would not say that the introduction of wages brought about any sort of additional achievements, and so I continued to defend my point of view. I pointed out that when the communards worked without pay they did everything they were expected to do, overfulfilling the plan and doing more than their day's norm, and that they had no quarrel with the material side of their life.

But I was surrounded by such strong opponents who couldn't have been less interested in my pedagogical ambitions but who were certain that wages would raise efficiency and give the pupils an incentive, and whose point of view was so actively supported by my superiors that I had neither the chance nor the strength to fight this tendency, and as a result my last years of work were spent in conditions of wages.

Therefore I can now discard that which I may perhaps call the negative conditions of a work education. I mean the absence of production, the absence of collective work, with nothing but isolated attempts in their place, that is, a labour process which is supposed to provide a work education.

Just now I cannot visualise the work education of communards without their being employed in industry. It is possible, I suppose, to educate people through work the character of which is not productive. I had a taste of it for a relatively short period at the Gorky Colony in the first years of its existence, when in view of the absence of an industrial arena and industrial equipment I had no choice but to content myself with industrial self-service, so to speak, and with a production process of sorts.... In any case I am quite sure that labour which does not aim to produce values is not a positive element of education, and therefore even that labour which is called industrial training should be based in the concept of values which can be created through toil.

At the Gorky Colony it was sheer need that compelled me to go over to production in a hurry. It was agricultural production. In conditions of children's communes farming is almost invariably a losing proposition. Within two years I succeeded, and then only thanks to the remarkable abilities and knowledge of the agronomist N. E. Ferre, in making our farm—a stock-raising and not a grain-growing farm, mind you—a paying concern. I went in for pig raising mainly. Eventually we had as many as two hundred sows and boars and several hundred young. This farm had the most up-to-date equipment. The specially built premises were kept as clean as the dormitories, sluiced regularly—there was running water, drains, sewers, taps and what not—and aired. There wasn't even any smell there, and the pig-tenders had the appearance of dandies. Now that we had this farm, equipped with all the latest devices and well provided with feed resources, we received a sizeable income from it and lived a more or less prosperous life. Besides good food and clothes we could now afford to buy everything we needed for the school, enlarge our library, build an excellent stage and fit it up. With the pig-raising money we bought instruments for our brass band and a film camera—things which in the 1920s we could never have bought out of our budget.

Besides, we helped our ex-pupils whose numbers were growing, our graduates who were studying in higher schools and happened to be hard up, and also those who got married and were starting a home of their own. Going on trips and receiving guests are also very expensive things. We went to the theatre very often, and generally we enjoyed all the good things of life which a working Soviet citizen is entitled to.

All those good things of life, which I have enumerated, made such a convincing stimulus for raising the productivity of labour that no one even thought about wages at the time.

True, I did recognise the need for the pupils to have pocket money, by and large I am a great believer in pocket money.... When a person enters the world he must have

some experience of living within a private budget, he must know how best to spend his money. He cannot go out into the world as a sheltered young miss straight from boarding school who has not an inkling of what money is. But at that time the Ukrainian People's Commissariat of Public Education took a determined stand against giving the inmates of the colony any pocket money, believing that in this manner I would teach them to be mercenary. And so the only way I could give a pupil any pocket money was by making a pact with him beforehand that he would not tell anyone about it. . . .

This pocket money, however, was handed out to pupils depending not on their production work but on their services in general to the collective.

I found myself in the same situation when I came to the Dzerzhinsky Commune, only here it was handicrafts and not farming. Here the communards depended on what they could produce even more. The Gorky Colony received state allocations against the estimates submitted, but the Dzerzhinsky Commune did not get a kopek, and I don't think it took anything from the state in all its existence. And so even keeping ourselves in food, enough not to feel hungry, even that depended entirely on what the collective was able to produce, to say nothing of buying any extra luxuries.

The conditions under which I had to begin were very, very difficult, much more so than at the Gorky Colony which did get a subsidy, after all. The Dzerzhinsky Commune was built on a grand scale. In the beginning it was run on somewhat philanthropic lines. The house was built as a monument to Felix Edmundovich Dzerzhinsky. It was a very beautiful building, one of the more splendid creations of the Soviet Union's best known architect, where even now no flaw can be found in the planning, the design of the façade, the ornaments, the shape of the windows, or anywhere else. The bedrooms were splendid, there was a magnificent hall, baths, showers, and spacious, beautiful school-rooms. The

communards were decked out in costly wool suits, and a sufficiency of clothing was provided for future wear. But not a single decent machine tool was installed. We had no kitchen garden, not a plot of land, and no state subsidy. It was hoped that everything would somehow take care of itself.

In the first years the Commune lived on what the Ukrainian Cheka men contributed from their salaries. They donated 0.5 per cent of their monthly pay, which added up to roughly 2,000 rubles. And I needed 4,000 or 5,000 rubles a month just to meet our current expenses, counting the school. There was nowhere I could get the two or three thousand of which I was short, since there was no place for us to work. We did have, by misadventure, three workshops—shoemaker's, joiner's, and a sewing shop—in which the People's Commissariat of Public Education had been reposing its hopes from the beginning of time. These three workshops, as you know, were considered the beginning and end of the educational labour process. Work at the joiner's shop was to be done by hand; the shoemaker's shop contained a few pairs of lasts, several stools, some awls and hammers, but not a single machine tool and not a scrap of leather. The idea was that we would rear shoemakers who would manufacture hand-made shoes, in other words a type of artisan for whom we have absolutely no use just now.

The joiner's shop was equipped with several planes, that's all the tools there were, and we were expected to graduate good joiners who did everything by hand.

The sewing shop also answered pre-revolutionary standards, the idea being that we would produce capable housewives who, in a pinch, could hem a diaper, sew on a patch, or make a simple blouse.

Earlier, at the Gorky Colony, I had already been sickened by those workshops, and here even more so. I simply could not understand what they were there for. And so my council of commanders and I closed them down within the week, keeping some of the tools for our own needs.

During the first three years the Dzerzhinsky Commune suffered dire need. There were times when we had nothing to eat all day–just bread. You can judge how dire our poverty was from the fact that I received no salary the first eight months I worked there, and like the rest of the commune had to live on bread alone.... There were moments when we had not a kopek of cash among the lot of us, and then we had to go out and "cadge". And can you imagine, this need, in spite of the fact that we took it very hard and felt bitter about it, was a wonderful stimulus for the development of labour. The Cheka men–and I am very grateful to them for it–never agreed to put us on an allowance basis nor to ask the People's Commissariat to give us money for the maintenance of our pupils. It would really have been a shame for them to ask: they had built the commune but they could not afford to feed the communards. And so we bent all our efforts to make some money ourselves–we were moved by a frank desire to make money.

That first year we worked very hard in our joiner's shop, making chairs, lockers, and whatever else was needed for everyday use. We also had clients. Our workmanship was very poor, the clients were dissatisfied, and as a rule we lost money on it. The prices we charged barely covered the cost of materials, electricity, nails and glue, and we ourselves worked for free.

Help came to us through one happy circumstance. We invited Solomon Borisovich Kogan to be our production manager. He was a most unprincipled person as far as pedagogy was concerned, but he was extremely energetic. I am very grateful to this comrade, and feel that some day I should offer him my special thanks for those entirely new pedagogical principles which he introduced into my work for all his unprincipled attitude to pedagogy.

The very first words he said to me struck me as amazing. He was a fat person, with a paunch, short of breath, and very pushing.

"What? A hundred and fifty communards, three hundred hands can't earn the price of a bowl of soup? How can that be? They've got to know how to earn a living, it can't be otherwise."

This was a principle the soundness of which I used to doubt. Within a month Kogan proved to me that he was right. True, I had to give in to him on many of my pedagogical points of view.

He began with a rather bold venture. He went to the management of the Building Institute and said he would take an order for furniture.

He had no grounds at all for making this offer. We did not know how to make furniture, we had no equipment, no tools and no material. All we had was Solomon Borisovich Kogan and 150 communards.

Luckily the Institute people were credulous and naïve, and they accepted the offer.

"Make your order then," Kogan said.

The order was made—so many thousands of different articles for the lecture halls, so many tables, so many chairs, so many book cases, and so on. When I saw the 200,000 ruble order, my first reaction was to ring up the doctor or at least take Kogan's temperature.

"How could you take it on?" I asked him.

"We'll manage," he said.

"But still, how do we begin? We'll need money, you know, and we haven't any."

"It's always like that," he said. "The first thing a person always says is—'but there's no money!' And then he gets it from somewhere, and we'll get some too."

"But where? Who'll give it to us?"

"Aren't there enough fools in this world who will?"

And can you imagine, he did get the money. In that very same Institute he found a fool, excuse me the rudeness, who accepted Kogan's proposal.

"Where shall we store the furniture we make?" Kogan had asked him. "You're only digging the foundation

trenches for your building. The furniture will be ready soon, the question is where to store it?"

"There really seems no place to store it," the man had said.

"All right, we'll store it at our place."

"You've got room for it?"

"No, but we can build a storehouse. We'll need 50,000 rubles for it."

"All right, here's the fifty thousand," the man had said.

Well, we got fifty thousand rubles, and with the money we bought tools and material. Kogan took some more money from the Institute as down payment, and proceeded to make chairs which were not intended for our clients at all, but for a quick sale at the market. They were ordinary chairs, the first lot was clumsy and no use at all, but Kogan said that the communards would learn and in the meantime they could make the rungs. And he introduced division of labour. I was very doubtful about it.

He divided labour this way: one boy planed the wood, the second sawed it, the third trimmed it, the fourth polished it, the fifth checked it, and so on. This, however, was not teaching them a trade, and they began to say that they were not learning anything. At the general meeting the consensus of opinion was that the job they were doing was useful, they had to work for the good of the Commune, but at the same time they ought to derive a benefit for themselves from it and learn a skill, whereas making those rungs was not teaching them anything.

Solomon Borisovich proved that he really knew his job. He broke the work on a chair into ten operations, and each of the communards had one specific operation to perform. As a result we began to put out chairs in countless numbers.

Before long our yard was cluttered with chairs, which it must be said were of a very poor quality. At first Kogan relied mostly on the finishing touches he made afterwards: he invented a special putty, made from glue and sawdust, and with it filled all the small cracks, then he polished the

wood, and so on. Anyhow he put this initial capital of 50,000 rubles to good use, and in six months' time we had 200,000. Then he bought more tools and material and began to turn out theatre-house furniture.

Later, Solomon Borisovich became less of a figure with us, having been appointed supplies manager—a job where he could put his knowledge and his talent to the best use. A new engineer came to take his place, but still I remained convinced that Kogan's division of labour was a useful thing. It is a depressing sight at first glance, but when you have watched it for some time you realise that there is nothing terrible about it. Each of the boys and girls performs one operation for some time—which is hardly learning a skill, you'd think—but after a few years when the pupil has become practised in many different operations and has reached the stage when he is trusted with the final and most difficult ones, such as assembly, he really becomes a highly skilled joiner, a worker needed in large social production and not simply in cottage industry.

Of course, if I had stopped at woodworking my communards would have been good only for employment at woodworking factories, and factories, mind you, where the work was broken up into many operations. But such was the success of our business, the success of our labour productivity, I mean, that after we'd had Kogan a year with us we were able to thank the Cheka men and ask them to make no more contributions to the Commune out of their pay. At the end of the second year we already had 600,000 rubles in the bank.

That's how much we got from our furniture-making. And now with 600,000 rubles in the bank our standing was no longer that of a charity institution but of a serious enterprise which could be trusted.

The bank gave us loans for building. In 1931, we built our first factory. It was a regular factory of the metal-working industry producing precision drills, which until then we had imported from abroad. Each drill had a motor

of its own, 150 parts, numerous gear-wheels requiring both milling and gear-cutting machines, very complicated assembling and casting, but all this notwithstanding our communards, with their division of labour experience to fall back on, were able to master the metalworking processes in a very short time. The psychology of a person working on one and the same part and striving for perfection in this process also came in useful here. It took them no more than six weeks to learn how to operate those highly complicated machine tools, and the operators were boys and girls of thirteen or fourteen.

The enterprise was such a great success that we started building another one, a factory producing photo cameras. This very complex factory had commune-made equipment. As it stands today, it is the Commune's own. Not all factories have the machine tools you can see there. The production process is very complicated, demanding precision to within a micron, that is to say it calls for a complete set of special tools and a highly efficient technique of verification.

I am sure we would never have mastered it if we had not begun with chairs and division of labour. I realised that it did not matter what you began with, the important thing was the logic of the given production, based on the latest data which are: division of labour and plan.

A person who has nothing to do with industry will find it hard to understand what a production plan is. It does not simply stipulate that so many tables and chairs must be made. It is a fine lacework of norms and relations. It is a lacework involving different parts, different units, the movement from one machine tool to the other. The plan has to make provision for the equipment, the quality of the material, its delivery, the issue of tools, the sharpening of cutters and the refilling of stocks, and last but not least—technical control, which at a good factory also means an assortment of devices, norms and conditions. The production plan is the most complex "machine" regulating human

activity. And it is in the intricacies of this machine that our citizens should be trained since they are employed not in cottage industry but in large-scale state production, organised on the highest level of technical efficiency.

Needless to say, now that we had those two regular factories, the sewing and joiner's shops, and even the furniture-making shop where the tool was turned by hand, became unimaginable things....

Gradually, our manual training grew into industrial training, and it surpassed my expectations. And yet, in my last years at the Commune it no longer surprised me to see a boy of thirteen or fourteen operating a group of milling machines which called for a knowledge of mathematics and a very quick mind, to say nothing of an expert knowledge of the quality of both the material and the cutter, an ability to read drawings, and so forth.

Beside the boy of fourteen or fifteen who, being an excellent milling-machine operator, had charge of a group, you would see a shop manager of sixteen or seventeen. True, it would be one of the simpler shops, but at nineteen he would certainly be put in charge of a more complex one. Such was the career of Volodya Kozyr, my one-time "liaison officer", whose job had been to run and find someone for me.

This road which would take an adult as much as ten years to cross, takes a boy or a girl no more than one or two. The road I chose for them was far from easy, and at first it seemed incredible that they should be making such enormous strides. As far as the girls go I've got to say this: they reach a Stakhanovite's rates of output as quickly as the boys, only not in metalworking but in assembly, fitting, and other light physical work, especially in the production of lenses where the accent is on precision and neatness. They were better in this than our boys. The boys' strong point was their gift for designing, and the girls'—their efficiency in the intricate processes which called for precision. The production of lenses was their province, since

the boys were unable to cope with it. To say nothing of output, the girls also left the boys far behind in the organisation of production when it came to a process like assembly of the finest parts which demanded a great precision of movement, keen eyesight, and meticulous observance of the order in which the pieces were laid out on the table.

By and large our boys were dedicated metalworkers. Not so the girls—metal evoked no emotions in them. The sight and touch of iron, brass and nickel always make a boy's heart miss a beat. The girls, on the other hand, tried to keep away from milling machines and especially such machine tools where they were liable to get spattered with oil and dirt.

Our girls never even tried working in the foundry.

Well, those are the kinds of jobs my collective began to do in its last year.

If you look upon this work from the angle of the conventional understanding of a pedagogical process, that is, here's the pupil and there's his teacher, then it will perhaps appear incorrectly set up, but if you look at it from the point of view of the collective and observe it for a time, you will find it very attractive.

Any factory with a complex production process provides vast opportunities for the satisfaction of all tastes and inclinations, and that in itself is a wonderful thing.

At a factory like FED we had a large design room, where dozens of draughtsmen were busy working, a planning department, a control department, a large instrument-making shop, and a commercial department, and so every pupil was able to find an outlet for his ambitions. The design office employed communards exclusively (designers and draughtsmen). Naturally, only those who were interested in the work and had a talent for it went there.

The highest qualification was to be obtained at the instrument-making shop. This was the crowning point in a boy's industrial training after he had worked in all the other shops and departments.

I see how useful this process of production is, in its every separate point, for moulding a person's character. My graduate communards, who are either studying at various institutes or have already completed their higher education, often come from town to see me. Among them there are historians, geologists, physicians, engineers, designers, and so on. But there is one feature peculiar to all of them—a broadness and versatility of views, habits, etc.

A short while ago one of them, a surgeon, came to see me. I remember he used to work as a grinder operating a huge grinding machine on which a part had to be brought to the extreme of precision, to within a hundredth of a millimetre. The foreman would say to him: "Here, remove a hundred, will you."

The boy would make the part secure in the chuck, and without verifying anything or using any measuring instruments, take off the "hundred".

His eyes, hands and machine tool worked in such practised harmony that his work needed no checking. His sense of the machine tool was perfect. That excellent grinder is now a surgeon, and in his philosophy I can even now sense his tremendous respect for accuracy. Watching the other former communards, I can see reflected in them the attitudes and habits acquired in our various organisational and industrial jobs.

A collective which owns a factory and is answerable for it acquires habits of organisation, which are needed most of all, perhaps, to a citizen of the Soviet Union. This ability to organise is exercised at every general meeting, at every commanders' production conference, in group and shop meetings, or simply during everyday conversation, and the collective inevitably becomes accustomed to demanding a responsible attitude from every worker and from every communard. If you must picture all the complexities of production, you must also picture all the complexities of a person's attitude to production. At a general meeting, attended by pupils from the mechanical shop, the optical

shop, this assembly shop and that assembly shop, and the instrument-making shop, someone would raise the question about, say, the short supply of some parts. Boys from the assembly shop would take the floor, inviting others who have nothing to do with the matter to say what they thought. They would get up and make suggestions, I mean they understand what those short-supplied parts were and they spoke as organisers.

They exercised their organisers' abilities even more in the workshops during work. Even to take charge of a group of milling machines a person has to be a good organiser and manager.

I realise that organising such production is anything but easy, but, after all, we can't talk of easy things only. In my own case, the organisation of this production cost me sixteen years of toil, sixteen years of need and struggle. Oh well, I am sure that any children's collective, if it has a mind to go into serious production work, will spend no less than ten years either, and the first generations, of course, who will struggle to build it up will graduate without tasting all the fruit of their labours. The next generations will, though.

You must not think that the first generations will mind. After all, striving towards a goal set years away is of great value in itself, both as far as character-building and work experience are concerned. Perhaps the main thing in all this process is the collective striving, this forward-looking attitude, this advance towards a definite goal.

I am happy in the thought that my collective always had clearly set aims to strive for, that it did not simply move forward in space but surmounted difficulties on the way, even poverty and friction within the collective. And if a collective is really marching towards a definite goal, if these very words are used consciously, then the question of wages becomes a matter of less basic importance. In a working collective where labour achievements are obvious, where well-being is self-evident, where every ruble of profit

promises something for the morrow, people do not need the incentive of their personal earnings.

Wages were introduced later on, but still I managed to preserve the collective spirit and to alleviate the harm wages might have done to the youngsters. Wages in the case of a grown man who has a family and a responsibility towards it is one thing. When it comes to a collective of youngsters, I'll move heaven and earth to keep them in clothes. I am answerable for them, for their clothing, food, housing and schooling. That being so, wages come as a sort of extra satisfaction anyway, and in a good collective they can receive these satisfactions without wages. I succeeded in getting them to hand their wages to me to be used with my permission. It was a resolution adopted by the general meeting. And the communards were keener on depositing money in their savings account for their future life than getting it in cash to spend.

Towards the end we made it a rule for every communard to contribute ten per cent of his pay to the council of commanders' fund. It was no trifling matter: ten per cent out of everyone's monthly pay was a lot of money.

And in this manner we built up the fund very quickly. The right to dispose of it belonged to the council of commanders, it was not the personal property of anyone. The money was mainly intended for cultural needs and for rendering assistance to former communards.

You cannot imagine what it's like to hear the council of commanders announce their decision: "Ivan Volchenko is very gifted musically, he must be sent to the conservatory and we shall give him 100 rubles a month extra until he graduates."

At the Dzerzhinsky Commune dozens of these scholarships were granted. The year I left as many as a hundred boys and girls were getting those monthly extras. The maintenance grant paid to students by the state is enough if one has a father and mother, or relatives. It isn't if a person is all on his own. It was a good, humane deed on

the part of the communards to give the students a monthly allowance of 50-100 rubles depending on how well they were acquitting themselves and what year they were in.

Money out of this fund was also sent to ex-communards who happened to be in need, provided there was a plausible reason for it and not just laziness. A fund like that allows the Commune to control the destinies of all the graduates until the time they are quite ready to go out into the world on their own.

The money was earned by the communards. Never once in all the years I was with them did I hear a single one of the communards begrudge the ten per cent of his pay either openly or by implication. I must also tell you that every communard was bought a "trousseau" out of this fund—bedding, a blanket, an overcoat, six shirts and a suit, in short, what every mother gives her son when he leaves the nest.

A fund like this, by means of which the life of the communards can be guided, is worth thousands of our pedagogical premises that have yet to be tested in practice.

The remaining ninety per cent of their wages were usually deposited in the savings bank, and each communard was expected to have a thousand rubles saved up by graduation time. They could not get their money in cash at the Commune, and none could be drawn without my endorsement. There were communards who got as much as 2,000-2,500 rubles on graduation, having saved the money in the five or six years they lived with us. A small part of their wages was handed out to them as pocket money. We went on travels every year. I attributed great significance to these excursions which were not ordinary trips but very big undertakings. The Dzerzhinsky Commune made six such trips. We planned them like this: first we went by train, then we walked a distance of at least 80-100 km, pitched camp and stayed there for some time, then we walked back the same distance again, and came the rest of the way home by train. We mapped out the route in the autumn. It

was very important to have a prospect like that for next summer, exactly the same sort of pleasant prospect you have before you when you plan your summer holiday, dream about it and make preparations for it. The collective made ready for it in the same way. When our factories closed down for the summer we knew exactly how and where we would spend our holidays.

I found those travels enormously helpful. In the course of the school year I used the coming trip as something round which I could rally the different pupils and the collective, I got them to save up for it and make various preparations which included cultural work, etc. For instance, we spent one whole winter planning our Caucasus-Vladikavkaz-Tbilisi-Batumi trip. We even sent out a scout to investigate, so we would know beforehand where we were to sleep and eat. The scout was one of the communards. In latter years we planned our trips in such minute detail that we knew, for instance, when the five hundred of us marched out of Kharkov, at which mile post exactly communard Ivanov would hand the bass to communard Petrov to carry. Ivanov could not carry it all the 400 km of the Military Georgian Road, he played it when he had to, but the others carried it for him, ten kilometres each. Every one of them knew at which mile post exactly he would be handed the bass and who would be the next one to carry it.

Trifles such as these had to be planned beforehand so the march would not be a strain. And as for the more serious things—where to board the train, where to spend the night so there would be a roof over our heads, water to be had nearby, and people with whom we could talk and arrange a meeting—someone had to go out and do some scouting every time.

Our longest itinerary was Kharkov-Nizhni-Novgorod-Stalingrad-Sochi-Odessa-Kharkov. The trip lasted six weeks and required a lot of planning. We sailed down the Volga for fifteen days, and every day the captain asked the communards:

"Do we go on or stop?"

"Full speed ahead to the Kama and then back to the Oka."

He even drank vodka with our permission only. He was a terrible drunkard, and we had him up before our general meeting after he had run aground near Samara. It was all great fun, of course, but anyway we begged him not to drink any more until the end of the voyage.

Every communard saved up for the trip, putting a bit aside from his pocket money to buy all those treasures which supposedly we would come across on our voyage. As a rule there were no special treasures to be had, and the boys and girls bought wallets, handbags, drank lemonade and ate sweets—all of which was available in Kharkov. But the sweets in Ulyanovsk taste sweeter than the same kind in Kharkov.

They put the money in my cash box to save for them. And I always took a suitcase full of money along on our travels, fifty or sixty thousand rubles.

So you see all these devices helped to lessen the greed for money, for wages, which in a collective provided with everything might have made a very difficult and unpleasant thing burdening the educative process.

I forgot to tell you that on the question of school and work relations I have always been against any sort of link, and for that I was persecuted in no mild manner. I am against it to this day, and my profound conviction is that if we have a ten-year school in the district or at a colony which answers all the requirements of the People's Commissariat of Public Education—and these requirements are growing from day to day—it needs no link with production, it is even useful to have no such link.

I am profoundly convinced that the sermons we hear about forming a link are survivals of a belief in the system of complexes, which I always detested because it is my considered opinion that a certain role must be preserved for the free formation of associations, and that only this

free formation can give a personality breadth and uniqueness, whereas we can create only a dull, uninteresting personality wherever we try to stir it to greater activity through associatve relations.

Therefore in my practical work the one and only deviation from my convictions which I permitted myself was adding two hours of draughting a week for each form. For the rest, our school was governed by the teachers' council as any other school, and had no connection with production whatsoever. We have our own laws, requirements and aims in every field of knowledge, learning and teaching, and these requirements have to be satisfied equally in all cases.

As a result the healthiest and most natural of links was formed. The graduate had a sound knowledge of production, the organisation and the processes of production, and he was, besides, an educated person, with a secondary-school education.

And when the representatives of theoretical thought took exception to this, I told them that a secondary school education and the highest qualification of a milling-machine operator made a wonderful combination and did not need to have anything added to it. After all, it's no cause for complaint that a person knows how to operate a machine tool.

By and large I believe that only in conditions of a full secondary school education can a character be remoulded and a juvenile delinquent reformed. As I have said, an incomplete secondary school education does not give one the same confidence as a full ten-year school.

And now for the concluding part of my report about the basic type and character of the individuals that ought to be shaped in our educational collective. In my opinion, we pedagogues have more thinking to do on this point. I am profoundly convinced that the traits of our Soviet personality differ fundamentally from the traits of personality in bourgeois society, and therefore our upbringing should also be fundamentally different.

In bourgeois society upbringing is limited to the individual, adapting him to the struggle for existence. And quite naturally the traits of character needed for this struggle have to be cultivated in the individual: cunning, diplomacy, fighting one's own personal battles, fighting for oneself.

And it is quite natural that in our old school, as in any bourgeois school, this complex of dependencies, essential in a bourgeois society, was cultivated. In that society the chain of dependencies is entirely different from what it is in ours.

You will remember our schooldays. No one actually told us in so many words that we would be dependent on the wealthy class and the officialdom, but the very essence of our upbringing was permeated with the thought. And even when we were told that the rich ought to help the poor, even that beautifully sounding, really splendid idea contained a certain indication of that dependence which exists between the rich and the poor. The idea that a rich man would help me, a poor boy, implied that he had riches, it was within his power to help me, while all I could look forward to were his help, his handouts, the help of a rich man. And I, a poor boy, was an object of his charity. In this way the system of dependencies which we would be confronted with in life was deeply impressed upon us. A dependency on position, on wealth, on charity and cruelty —such was the chain of dependencies for which a person was trained.

We also prepare our pupils for a definite chain of dependencies. It is a terrible delusion to suppose that a pupil, once having freed himself from the system of dependencies of a bourgeois society, i.e., from exploitation and an inequitable distribution of material benefits, is free altogether from any chain of dependencies at all. In Soviet society there is a different chain of dependencies, the dependency of members not simply thrown together but living an organised life and striving for a definite goal. And in this organisation of ours there are processes and phenomena

which determine the morals of a Soviet person and his behaviour.

All of us living in Soviet society develop and mature as members of a collective, that is as people within a definite system of dependencies. I do not know if I have probed this matter to the end in my work, but this aspect of education always interested me most of all. I have already spoken a little about it when I mentioned discipline.

To see this problem more clearly, let us look at a collective in action, I mean a collective and not a crowd, that is to say a collective which has definite common aims. The dependencies in this collective are very involved, for each separate individual has to co-ordinate his personal desires with the desires of others: first, with the collective as a whole and, second, with the primary collective of its immediate group, co-ordinating them in such a way that his personal aims would not be antagonistic to the common aims. Consequently, it is the common aims which should determine one's private aims. This harmony of common and private aims shows the character of Soviet society. For me, common aims are not simply the main and the dominating aims, they are actually linked with my personal aims. I suppose it is the only way in which to build up a children's collective. If a different pattern is followed, I assert that it will not be Soviet education.

In the practice of a collective, the contraposition of private and collective aims and the need to harmonise them are problems which arise at every step. If one senses a contradiction, it means that it is not a Soviet collective, it means that it is organised incorrectly. And only where the common and the personal aims coincide and there is no disharmony whatever, only that collective can be called a Soviet collective.

But this problem cannot be solved without contact with the routine trifling happenings of everyday life. It can be solved only in the practice of each individual communard and each separate collective. Practice is what I call the

style of work. I think the question of style in educational work should be regarded as worthy of special monographs being devoted to it, that's how important I think it is.

Let us take a detail like the relations of the communards with one another, the attitude of one boy to another. The question is not new, it would seem, and yet only a feeble answer is given to it in our pedagogical theory. The problem could hardly exist in pre-revolutionary pedagogy. There, just as in pre-revolutionary society, the relations of people were treated as relations of one individual with another individual, that is to say, as relations between two free and independent worlds, and one could speak about bringing up a good person, a kind person, or this and that person.

In our pedagogy we can speak of bringing up a comrade, of the attitude of a member of one collective to a member of another collective, of members who do not revolve freely in empty space but are bound by their obligations to or their relations with the collective, by their duty to the collective, their honour as members of the collective, and their actions in regard to the collective. This organised attitude of the members of one collective to the members of another collective must play a decisive role in our educational set-up.

What is a collective? It is not simply a gathering, or a group of interacting individuals, as the pedologists used to teach. It is an organised community of personalities pursuing a clear purpose and governed by its collective bodies. If a community is properly organised, it will have its collective bodies and an organisation of the collective's representatives empowered by it, and the question of a person's attitude to his comrade is not a question of friendship, affection or good neighbourliness, but a question of responsible dependence. Even if the comrades are in the same position, march shoulder to shoulder and perform practically the same functions, they are linked not simply by friendship but by their common responsibility for the job and by their joint participation in the collective's work.

Of particular interest are the relations of comrades who do not march in the same line but march in different lines, and of even greater interest are the relations of comrades who are not equally dependent on one another, with one being subordinate to the other. That's the most tricky thing in a children's collective, it is the hardest thing to create relations of subordination and not equality. It's the thing our teachers fear most of all. A pupil must be able to obey his comrade, not simply obey but know how to obey him.

And in his turn he must know how to order his comrade, that is, to entrust certain functions to him and demand their execution.

This ability to obey a comrade–submitting not to force, wealth or charity, but to each other as equal members of a collective–is an extremely difficult thing to inculcate not only in a children's community but even in a society of adults. If there are any surviving vestiges of the old philosophy, it is precisely here that they cling most tenaciously. A person finds it hard to give an order to his equal just because he has been told to do so by the collective. The complex of dependencies here is extremely involved. But he will know how to give an order to a comrade, entrust him with something, rouse him to action and be answerable for him, if he feels responsible for it to the collective and knows that, by giving the order, he is carrying out the will of the collective. If he does not feel any of this, he will have scope for nothing better than the exercise of his personal vanity, his love of domination and power, and all the other inclinations alien to us.

I paid particular attention to this side of the matter. And that's why I was prepared to adopt a very intricate pattern of dependencies and subordinations within the collective. Take the commander on duty: today he controls the collective, and tomorrow he has to take orders from the boy or girl he will hand over his duties to. This is an excellent example to illustrate the system of education I am speaking about.

I went even further in this respect, I tried to intertwine the dependencies of the different representatives as much as possible in order that submissions and orders might cross with the utmost frequency.

That was why I started the system of primary collectives on principles of one-man management, the right to exercise which I gave my commanders. I tried to break up the collective into detachments of ten people to have as many commanders as possible, I also tried to set up as many different commissions as I could, and later I arrived at another form—that of giving assignments to individuals.

I never missed a chance to use this form. I'll give you the first example I can think of. Supposing the pupils have to be moved from one dormitory to another, the arrival of new boys and girls necessitating this regrouping. The newcomers, it must be said, were always distributed among the old detachments. The council of commanders decides that moving is to begin at such and such an hour. Only bedding may be taken along; the beds, tables, portraits and lockers are to remain where they are. A boy, let's call him Kozyr, is made responsible for the moving. At first he finds it anything but easy. The boys refuse to obey him, they dismiss his orders with a wave of the hand, and he does not know how to manage the four hundred of them.

In later years I got things running so smoothly that not just Kozyr but the others too knew what they had to do. Kozyr was stationed in the corridor, directing the show with a movement of his finger, a stare, or a raised eyebrow, and everyone realised that Kozyr was answerable for success, that Kozyr would be held responsible if someone took the best portrait to his new dormitory, he'd be called to account for neglecting his duties.

Supposing I had to take twenty waifs off an evening train. The council of commanders always selected a special team of five or six people for the purpose. Zemlyansky, say, would be appointed commander. And he understood perfectly that he was the commander, and the team of five or six carried

out all his orders immediately, without question. They took a certain pleasure in it, they liked the idea of having a central figure to guide them and take the responsibility for them.

And this Zemlyansky understood that the whole operation was entrusted to him, and the team understood it too. At the railway station, they knew where the waifs had to be taken off the roofs of coaches and elsewhere, how to pick out the better lads who could be relied upon, and not the snivelling weaklings. And they did pick out the best of the lot. Zemlyansky was in charge. I could not interfere. He had an assignment to carry out and he had to account for his actions. I could not really spare the time, but no matter how late the hour or how hard pressed I was, I nevertheless made it a point to hear his report and assess his work as satisfactory. good or unsatisfactory.

Not a day passed without there being an opportunity to give one of the communards some assignment as an exercise in responsibility. As a rule he would be given several assistants from different detachments. Supposing some boys had a fight and refused to make up the quarrel. A comrade would be appointed at once to find out what had caused the quarrel, get the boys to make it up, and then account for his own actions in the matter.

Serious responsibility was a means of solving many problems. It goes without saying that all these were extra duties over and above the general work of the detachment. A detachment was really answerable for its actions.

I observed how in some children's homes care was taken to organise the work in this manner, but no one took the trouble to demand efficiency or strict responsibility. Yet without responsibility there can be no real work. It is as important to demand a responsible attitude to work in industry, to school studies, and to one's duties as a member of a joint team. Take a small matter like going to the bathhouse: even there someone must be put in charge. This personal responsibility must be blended with the responsibility of the

whole collective. If this blend is not achieved, if the persons responsible are not in complete harmony with each other, the whole thing may become a game and nothing more.

The style of work, the style of the collective is built up from all these techniques, all these assignments. As I have already said, monographs ought to be written on this subject.

The style of work in a Soviet children's collective must, I think, have the following distinctive features.

First of all, high spirits. I make this quality the cornerstone. Constant good cheer, no gloomy faces, no sulky expressions, a constant readiness for action, and a good mood, I mean a happy, buoyant mood and not a hysterical gaiety. Readiness for useful action, interesting, sensible action with a purpose, and never just gadding about, screaming, shrieking and generally behaving like the inmates of a zoo.

I emphatically object to such animal behaviour as shrieking, squealing and dashing about. At the Dzerzhinsky Commune where we had five hundred boys and girls you'd never hear any shrieking or shouting. And yet you'd always see them in a happy, cheerful mood, secure and confident.

This cheerfulness cannot, of course, be created by any special methods: it comes as a result of the collective's work, of all that I have spoken of earlier.

The second feature is a sense of dignity. Naturally, it cannot be cultivated overnight. This confidence in one's own person stems from appreciation of the collective's value, from pride in one's own collective.

If you come to the Commune you'll be met very politely, very amicably. It's unheard of that a boy would walk past and fail to greet you. The first person you meet will be sure to say:

"How d'you do. Whom would you like to see, please?"

And everyone would be on the alert.

"What is your name, and what is your business?"

No one will ever complain about the Commune to you. I have observed some amazing things in this respect. Take a

communard who has just been hauled over the coals for something, and he is still in the extreme of distress. And suddenly he encounters a stranger, a visitor. An immediate change will come over him, he'll look happy and cheerful, and he'll offer to take you wherever you want to go. If a permit to enter is needed, he'll say: "Come with me to get a permit."

He is preoccupied with his personal troubles, his mistake, but he'll thrust everything into the background and never let you see that he was distressed a minute ago. If you ask him: "How's life?" he'll answer: "Fine."

He'll do it not because he wants to please, but because he feels responsible for the collective, and even though punished he takes pride in his collective.

Or again supposing a boy has just been punished for something, and suddenly an excursion arrives.

"What a nice boy!" they'll say. "Is he doing well?"

No one will ever mention it by so much as a word that he has been punished. It would be considered poor taste, it's our own affair, and we'd never betray him to strangers.

This dignified tone is very difficult to cultivate, it takes years. Politeness to every visitor, to every comrade, must be perfect, of course. But this politeness must always be accompanied by a readiness to resist the attempts of strangers, idly curious characters, and the more so of enemies, to get in, to steal into the collective. And so, although the communards will greet you very politely and take you wherever you want to go, they'll first ask: "Who are you? What is your business?"

And if they see that you have no real business to be there, they'll tell you just as politely: "Sorry, I can't let you in. But if you come on business next time you'll be very welcome."

There was never a lack of loafers who wanted to get in from idle curiosity.

This type of politeness stems from a most essential ability which we ought to develop in every one of our citizens. It

is the ability to size up a situation. You have probably noticed the lack of it in a collective of children or a crowd. A person sees only that which is before his eyes, and does not notice what is behind him.

The ability to feel what is going on around you, what surrounds you, what is going on in the other rooms which you can't see, to feel the tone of life, of that particular day, is very difficult to cultivate and requires great effort and constant thought. The screaming and shouting which we so often hear in a children's collective shows, above all else, a complete lack of orientation, an awareness of one's own self and one's own movement alone. There's no awareness of environment. But a real Soviet citizen must feel what is going on about him with his every nerve. It's one thing when you are among old friends. You are then free to behave in a certain manner. But it's another thing when you are among new pupils, some of whom were only brought in the day before. If a communard knows it, he won't say anything the newcomer should not hear. Or again, supposing a woman or a young girl is walking past. She is nothing to him, but he must adjust his behaviour accordingly. If I am anywhere near, the communard must know and feel that I, the head of the collective, am near. He must also adjust himself to the situation if it is someone else, a teacher, an instructor, an engineer, or an official.

This does not mean that he has to adapt himself to or ingratiate himself with anyone. It means that he had to feel what his behaviour ought to be in different situations involving different members of the collective.

I noticed that most of the boys and girls living in children's homes and colonies adopt a most unbecoming tone when talking to visitors. Never having seen the person before, they begin to tell him their grievances, complaining against the teachers, the superintendent, and each other. I set out to put an end to this carrying of tales to strangers. Self-criticism was all very well, but telling sob stories, grumbling and

"squealing", as the communards called it, in the presence of any strangers was not to be tolerated.

The communards were very often displeased with something or other. They voiced their complaints at the council of commanders' meetings, but they never permitted themselves to "squeal" to strangers, to whom the collective had to appear a single whole. An urge to complain is not the same as criticising. It is the condition of someone who feels unhappy in the collective, it shows that the collective itself and some of its members are given to snivelling. The idea of security has to be prominent in a collective, adorning its whole style. It has to be developed through pride in the collective, by making demands upon every single individual, giving the individual a sense of security from bullying, hazing and petty tyranny.

This sense of security comes with experience. I succeeded in making it so that even the youngest, the most vulnerable of the boys and girls of ten or twelve did not feel inferior to the older members of the collective. In work–yes, when something wanted doing–yes, but not as persons. They had self-confidence because they felt perfectly protected, they felt that no one could do them an injury, because if any harm was threatening he would be protected from it by his detachment, his work team, myself, and, what is more important still, by the first comrade who came his way.

This idea of security can't appear spontaneously, it would seem, it also has to be created and worked on. While encouraging high spirits, energy, action and movement, one should at the same time teach the pupils to decelerate when necessary. It is this that an average tutor achieves rather rarely. Putting on the brakes on oneself is a very difficult thing to do, in childhood especially, and since it will not come from simple biology it has to be taught. And it's up to the tutor to teach it, for a child will never develop the ability of his own accord. A person has to pull himself up at every step, it must become a habit manifesting itself in every

physical and mental movement, and particularly so in arguments and quarrels. How often we see children quarrelling simply because they lack this ability. And our communards realised perfectly that a person without brakes was as bad as a broken-down engine.

To train a child to give in to his comrade is another difficult job. Considerations of the collective's good helped me to achieve this. Before the children got carried away, I'd put on the brakes—stop—and the quarrel did not materialise. I succeeded in averting quarrels, and even more so fights, scandal-mongering and tale-bearing for months in a row. And my success was due solely to the fact that they knew how to decelerate. I did not "go at them", saying you're right and you're wrong.

Every one of you understands perfectly what cases I am referring to and what it can lead to. This style, of course, with all its peculiar features must be ingrained in every aspect of the collective's life without exception, including the rules and standards of formal behaviour—that which many ridiculed when analysing my work, refusing to acknowledge them as formal standards of behaviour.

I still consider it an extremely important rule that a communard should not hold on to the banisters, that he should not lounge against the wall, or talk to me or anyone else in that attitude; also, that his response to my every order, which I give him as his commander, should be "Yes, sir", and that until he has made the response his understanding of the order is not be accepted.

All this is very important. We made it a rule. Supposing Zemlyansky was put in charge of homework. He would tell another boy: "Nikolai, go and fetch me a pencil and a piece of paper." If Nikolai simply dashed off, Zemlyansky would say to him: "Where's your response?" "Yes, sir."

This outward smartness, this feeling of form, determines the inner content of behaviour as well. Those two, Zemlyansky and Nikolai, would perhaps play rounders or football together the rest of the day, but right then they were a

commander and his subordinate. And their relations had to take a definite outward form.

If I gave someone a punishment, I did not consider it accepted until the boy said: "Yes, sir."

This established form of politeness in business relations is an extremely useful thing, for it mobilises the will, gives one a feeling of efficiency and smartness, lays stress on the type of business relations involved and teaches one to draw a distinction between friendship, good-neighbourly relations, affection, chumminess and business.

I suppose one could manage without this, but it is the most economical form of business training, an outward form of business relations. And an outward form very often determines the content itself.

Eventually it became such an ordinary, natural matter of routine as if it could not have been otherwise. The salute reflex became so strong in the smallest chaps that no one would have called it a game or a joke, and as soon as they entered the sphere of business relations their business attitude reflex worked as naturally and quickly.

A boy would be playing some very exciting game out of doors. Running past the commander on duty he would hear him giving some minor order to someone. The boy would draw up to attention immediately.

All these standards of formal behaviour are senseless if there is no all-embracing style. This outward form, of course, cannot be introduced, or rather it will be an empty form if at the same time the pupils are not taught orientation, deceleration, responsibility, efficiency, self-reliance, or given a sense of security. This formal politeness, which may perhaps have a certain resemblance to militarisation but which, in fact, does not go farther than the principles of the Young Pioneer movement, is essential, useful and an adornment for the collective only provided this collective has a definite style and tone of work.

I cannot imagine how a child could want to live in a collective that is outwardly unattractive. Attractiveness is

an aspect of life which cannot be ignored. And yet we, teachers, very often take a somewhat nihilistic attitude to aesthetic education.

The pleasing appearance of a person, a room, a staircase, a machine tool is as important as beautiful behaviour. What behaviour is aesthetically pleasing? Behaviour which has been given form, for form itself is a sign of higher culture.

And so we come to another worry: taking aesthetics as the result of style, as an index, we begin to regard it as a factor of education in its own right.

I cannot give you a list of requirements for a beautiful life, but life must be beautiful without fail. They are two entirely different things—a child's beautiful life and an adult's. Children have their own kind of emotionality, their own measure of expressing their feelings. And the beauty of a children's collective cannot quite repeat that of an adult one.

For instance, play. There must always be play in a children's collective. If there is no play it is not a real children's collective. And by play I do not only mean that a boy plays football or some other game, I mean that he plays a little every minute of his life, he soars a bit in his imagination, makes tiny flights of fancy, he acts a little, and in play feels rather bigger than he is. Children can develop their imagination only if they are in a collective, and a playing collective at that. And I, being their teacher, have to play along with them a little. If I do nothing but teach, demand and insist, I will be an alien force, a necessary one maybe, but a strange one to them. It is imperative that I should play a little, and I demanded the same from all my colleagues.

I am quite a different person, of course, when I'm speaking with you, but when I am with children I have to put on a bit more cheer, use more humour and smile more, not ingratiatingly or anything like that, but just smile a pleasant and sufficiently imaginative smile. I must not simply prevail over the collective, I must be a member of it with pleasure

to give. I must impress them aesthetically, and so I never once appeared before my pupils in an unbelted blouse or boots that needed a shine. I, too, had to shine, to the best of my ability, of course. I, too, must be as cheerful as the collective. I never permitted myself to wear a melancholy expression. I had trained myself never to let the children see that I was worried by something or was unwell.

On the other hand, I had to be capable of storming, of reading the riot act. I saw an article in your pedagogical magazine last year about the tone in which one should talk to pupils. It said there: a teacher must speak to the pupil in a level tone. Why should he? Why in a level tone? I'm sure he'd be such a bore that the pupils would soon grow to hate him. No, I say that a teacher has to be gay, wide-awake, and really angry when something goes wrong, speaking quite sharply to make the pupils feel that he really is angry and not simply indulging in some pedagogical moralising.

This is a demand I made on all my staff. I dismissed excellent tutors without compunction, although their only fault was that they made things so dull and sad all the time. A grownup person working in a collective of children must know how to control his feelings and keep his troubles to himself.

A collective also needs outward adornment. For this reason, even when ours was very poor, I built a hothouse right away, and not just an apology for one but a big hothouse with an estimated hectare of flowers, and I did not mind the expense. And I insisted on planting roses and chrysanthemums, and never any wretched little blooms. The children and I loved fussing over the flowers. And we really did grow a hectare of flowers, real first-rate flowers. We had bowls of them standing in the bedrooms, the dining-room, class-rooms, studies, and even on the stairs. We made baskets out of tin and placed them all down the steps. It was an excellent idea. A detachment needed no written permission to get more flowers: when they wilted, someone would go to the hothouse and take a couple of pots.

All those flowers, clean rooms, clothes and boots are essential in a children's collective. Boots have to shine, what sort of upbringing is it otherwise? Children must clean their teeth regularly, and their shoes too. There must be not a speck of dust on their clothes. A neat head of hair is essential. The boys were free to dress their hair any way they liked so long as it was neat. To enforce this rule, a member of the Sanitary Commission made the rounds of the dormitories once a month with his clippers at the ready. If someone's hair was untidy, he'd run over it with the clippers: the victim was obliged to go to the barber's then to get the job finished. It helped, and all the boys took good care of their hair.

All these rules of cleanliness have to be enforced very strictly. Six months after leaving the Dzerzhinsky Commune I came back on inspection from Kiev. Everybody came running out, they shook my hand and gave me a very nice welcome generally. I went to look at the dormitories. Something was not quite right: there was dust in the room, a soiled handkerchief was lying on the bedside table of Yanovsky, my best commander, and when I opened his locker I found a whole pile of dirty things. I did not use a level voice then, I spoke in my real voice: "Ten hours under arrest, I'm not inspecting any more dormitories, I'll be here to check tomorrow morning." They sent a car for me to Kharkov early next morning, and when I inspected the room for dust I could not find a mote. "How did you manage so quickly?" I asked them. "We didn't go to bed."

I do realise, you know, that I demand what I think necessary, and others demand other things. Were I less exacting, the tone and the style would be gone. Everything has to be borne in mind. For instance, when lessons begin the member of the Sanitary Commission on duty asks the teacher: "Are you pleased with our form?" The teacher is in a tight spot: if he says he is, the Sanitary Commission will discover thousands of faults: dust in that corner, hands with black under the nails, fresh knife cuts on someone's desk.

And so whether he wants to or not a teacher has to be exacting.

If a teacher was dressed untidily I did not let him start lessons. And so we got used to wearing our best clothes to school. I, too, wore the best suit I had. We all looked dandified.

A very important point, that. Take the dinner table. An oilcloth is good and hygienic, you can put anything on it, wash it, and it will be nice and clean again. But only a white tablecloth can teach youngsters to be tidy eaters, whereas an oilcloth spoils them. At first the tablecloth will always be filthy and spotty, but in six months' time it will be as clean before dinner as after. You can't teach children table manners unless you give them a white tablecloth.

Every trifle has to be treated seriously, neatness has to be exacted at every step. Why chew pencils? A pencil must always be kept sharpened to a point. Why the rusty pen-nib, what's that fly doing in your ink-well? Add these trifles in their millions to the pedagogical demands which you already have in mind. It is too much for one person to cope with, but it can easily be done if the whole collective helps and knows the value of these trifles.

We had a boy with a rifle standing at the front door. He wore his best suit. He had to see that everyone wiped his feet on the door mat. Rain or shine, nobody was allowed to enter the building without wiping his feet first. The communard on guard understood perfectly well why he had to enforce the rule: he had to dust the rooms himself every day, and if all those who came in wiped their feet properly there would be less dust. The communards needed no reminding. Visitors sometimes asked: "But why must I wipe my feet, I came along a clean asphalt path." And the boy would have to explain to him: "Yes, but still you brought in two grams of dust."

Another trifling matter—the handkerchief. A clean handkerchief must be issued to everyone every day, it's obvious,

I should think. And yet I've seen children's homes where they change the handkerchiefs once a month, in other words they purposely teach children to wipe their noses with a filthy rag. But it's such a small expense, surely.

The cuspidor. A triumph of hygiene—a cuspidor in every corner! But why should anyone spit? That's what the boys said too: "Want to spit? Go to the hospital then, you're sick, you've got the camel sickness, healthy people don't spit all the time."

"But I smoke."

"If that's the kind of smoker you are, give it up quick, real smokers don't spit."

If a boy did not give up the habit of spitting, he'd be taken to the doctor by force. The doctor usually helped, persuading the boy that it was no more than a reflex.

A cuspidor in a corner usually marks the spot where spitting is allowed. And usually the wall behind it is filthy.

In the life of a collective these trifles are very many, and it is from them that the aesthetics of behaviour is built up. A boy who does not spit and blows his nose into a handkerchief, is already a well-behaved boy. These small basic requirements must be answered to the full, and moreover they must be thoroughly considered and brought in harmony with some general principles. There are many such trifles which can't be enumerated but which can be performed in a pleasing, healthy manner and linked to the collective's advance generally.

I shall end here. I am sure that what my colleagues and I did was done by many people in the Soviet Union. I only differ in that I have an urge to demand the same from everyone, I feel an urge to preach these ordinary rules, not my personal ones, but rules which a great many teachers in the Soviet Union have drawn up for themselves.

I also feel an urge to systematise them. I have myself observed very beautiful work being done in many of our schools, we have excellent collectives, splendidly organised,

with their own centre, their style and their beauty. This experience wants systematising, I think. It will be a pity if this large Soviet educational experience of a good twenty years gets lost. That's why I feel in duty bound to put down as much as I can in writing. Much of it is confused, perhaps, and there are many mistakes. But popularising Soviet pedagogical experience is a cause that must be carried on.

I think that it is your particular duty, I mean people working in Public Education, to get this experience summed up and to popularise the methods of the best Soviet educational establishments.

REQUEST READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of the contents and translation of this book.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics